

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XI, 1.

WHOLE No. 41.

---

## I.—THE DIRAE OF VALERIUS CATO.

Among the poems ascribed to Vergil in the life of the poet commonly attributed to Donatus, but now believed to be by Suetonius, *Deinde catalepton et priapia et epigrammata et diras, item cirim et culicem cum esset annorum xvi*, was one called DIRAE. Again, in a similar list of seven or eight opuscula supposed to be by Vergil, and which Servius mentions in his *Prolegomena to the Aeneid*, *scripsit etiam septem siue octo libros hos: cirim Aetnam culicem priapia catalepton epigrammata Copam Diras*, the DIRAE is mentioned last.

In accordance with these statements of antiquity we find in most MSS of Vergil which contain the opuscula, as well as in other MSS in which the opuscula have been transcribed apart, a poem thus headed: *Dirae Maronis* or *P. Vergilii Maronis Dirae*.

Näke, by whom this poem has been elaborately edited (Bonn, 1847), states that up to the time of Scaliger no hint of the real authorship of this work had been put forward by any philologist. Scaliger, in his edition of 1573, was the first to suggest that the real writer was the grammarian, Valerius Cato.

Suetonius in his *Lives of the Grammarians*, c. xi, states that he wrote, besides some grammatical works, poems, of which the *Lydia* and the *Diana* were considered the best. The *Diana* was thought by the poet Cinna worthy of living for centuries: Ticia styled the *Lydia* 'the chief puzzle of the learned,'

*Lydia doctorum maxima cura liber.*

Suetonius also tells us that Valerius Cato had been left a minor and had in consequence been dispossessed of his patrimony by the

licence of the Sullan period; and that he had himself stated this in a libellus intitled *Indignatio*.

These facts of the life of Valerius Cato agree with what the poem *Dirae* records. In it frequent mention is made of a woman called *Lydia*, of whom the poet was enamored; and the former and larger section of it, 103 lines out of 183, is occupied with an elaborate curse pronounced upon a farm, from which he had been ousted by a soldier, much as Vergil complains in the first Eclogue he had himself been.

About 200 years after Scaliger (so slow is the course of criticism), Friedrich Jacobs observing that the *Dirae*, as it has come down to us, is not one consecutive poem, but made up of two distinct poems, the first of which extends to the end of v. 103, and alone can justly be called a curse, concluded that this part alone belonged to the *Dirae*, the remaining 80 lines to the *Lydia*. Näke, accepting this view, goes on to show that they are only *part* of the *Lydia*, for the words of Ticida, *doctorum maxima cura*, whether interpreted as above, 'greatest puzzle,' or as Markland thought, 'supreme passion,' seem to point to something more than a composition of 80 lines; and he infers from the fact, mentioned in *Lyd.* 6-8, that Lydia used to sing verses of his, that these verses formed the other part of the complete *liber* known by her name. On this hypothesis the *Lydia*, as known to the poet's contemporaries, would have comprised a number of short poems, probably all amatory. To me the 80 verses seem not so much a separate Eclogue in a series as a fragment extracted from a larger poem. Both the first verse *Inuideo uobis agri, formosaque prata*, and the last, *Vt maneam quod uix oculis cognoscere possis*, have an abruptness little suited to the beginning or end of a poem.

A question will here be raised. Why should not these 80 verses be, as the MSS give them, the last part of an execratory poem? Is there anything impossible in a poet beginning by pronouncing a series of curses on the lands where he had been happy with his love, and which are now to be alienated to a strange soldier; then, as the force of his invective spends itself, turning to the thought of his love, and so to reflections on the happiness of the fields where she will remain, when he is himself forced to leave them; finally to bitter, but still softened, expostulations against the cruelty of fate which will not suffer him to consort any longer with the object of his passion, and forces him to languish and pine?

The answer to this must be drawn from general grounds of lite-

rary propriety. A poet with a grievance which cannot content itself without venting at the least computation 85 lines of formal cursing, would seriously damage the unity of effect, and therefore the total effectiveness of his poem, if he allowed his invective to subside into a querimonious love-complaint; if beginning with blood and fire he ended with sighing and tears.

The praises of Cinna and Ticiada, both of them eminent in poetry, are sufficient vouchers of Cato's literary skill; and we may feel assured that his poetic curse was self-consistent and, like the *Ibis* of a later writer, left a sustained impression of bitterness and indignation on the minds of those who read it. Besides, the poet of the *Dirae* himself tells us in express terms where his curse ended. In 97 he says, *Extremum carmen reuocemus, Battare, auena*: it is very unlikely that after this the poem should have gone on for eighty verses on a *new* theme.

We may assume then that the last eighty verses of the poem, which are wholly occupied with the poet's passion for Lydia, are absolutely distinct from the *Dirae*. They are, however, though distinct, connected with it by the occurrence of Lydia in both. What was the connexion? which of the two was written first? A brief abstract of these eighty verses will help us to decide.

1-21. I envy the fields where my beautiful Lydia will now live severed from me. They will see the maiden on whom my eyes used to look; and will hear her recite my verses in her praise, as she sings them reclining on the grass. Then will woods, fields, springs rejoice: the birds will be silent to listen; the brooks will run more slowly. Yes, I envy the fields for possessing a pleasure which once was mine only.

Observe the noticeable recurrence at an interval of 21 verses of the *Inuideo uobis agri, formosaque prata, Inuideo uobis agri, mea gaudia habetis*. This is like the recurring refrain of the *Dirae*—

Battare, cygneas repetamus carmine uoces,  
Rursus et hoc iterum repetamus Battare carmen  
Nec mihi saepe meum resonabit Battare carmen  
Tristius hoc memini reuocasti Battare carmen  
Dulcius hoc memini reuocasti Battare carmen  
Extremum carmen reuocemus Battare auena.

22. I meanwhile pine away with grief to think that Lydia is not with me. No maiden could be more beautiful or more cultured: Jove might have wooed her as bull or gold shower (*tauro Ioue*

*digna uel auro*). Happy the race of animals! The bull that leads the herd, the goat that heads the flock, are not separated from their mates: each male has his female.

37. Why was not Nature as kind to me? At evening when the stars return to the green sky the Moon is with her Endymion. Apollo loved a bay: all the Gods have had their favorites, whose emblems are still carried in their processions, or shine as constellations in the sky. In the Golden Age mortals were happier: witness the legends of Ariadne and Theseus, Medea and Jason.

50. What has our era done that the Gods should be so cruel now? Am I the first lover who ventured to consummate his passion? Would indeed that I were! My fame would be immortal, as the man who stole the sweets of passion first and was the originator of love's pleasure.

61. But Jupiter lay with Juno before he became her wedded husband amid the purple flowers of Ida. Mars was too busy with war, Vulcan with his forge, to notice. Aurora too wept a lover after Tithonus. Unhappy I, born in a time when such love was forbidden. My sad destiny has robbed me of happiness and reduced my body to a shadow.

From this abstract it appears that Lydia was a young girl of great beauty and highly cultivated, that she lived in the country, and there fell in the way of Valerius Cato, whom she inspired not only with an ardent passion, but (if we may trust the natural meaning of vv. 53-55 sqq.) a passion which came to more than words. In the poem before us he expresses his misery at being obliged to part from her; she would now roam through the fields unattended and alone: he meanwhile is reduced to a mere shadow of his former self by grief at his separation.

In the *Dirae* Lydia is also spoken of as living in the country, and a wood which is specially called hers is doomed by the poet's curse to extinction by lightning: for Jupiter wills himself to destroy the trees which were under his own special protection. She is again mentioned at the end of the *Dirae*. There the poet takes at the same moment farewell of his farm and of Lydia, declaring that alive or dead she should ever be with him, and that her memory would remain in his breast after she had been resolved into elemental fire and water.

Näke thought that the *Lydia* fragment was written before the *Dirae*, on some occasion when Cato had been forced to leave his home in the country, possibly on tiresome business in Rome,

leaving his Lydia to her seclusion. If indeed the fields which in the *Lydia* fragment he describes himself as envying for the uninterrupted possession of such a treasure could be shown to be identical with the fields which in the *Dirae* are laid under a solemn curse; if the woods which in the *Lydia* fragment will rejoice at the presence of Lydia, when the poet has left her, are part of the forest-ground to which the *optima siluarum* known as Lydia's wood in the *Dirae* belong, it follows almost necessarily that the *Lydia* fragment was prior to the *Dirae*. For in the latter poem, the whole landed domain of the poet, now assigned to a new proprietor, is laid under a curse; part is to be blasted by lightning, part consumed by fire, part submerged by the sea. The poet has taken his leave of it: henceforth he will not associate it with his happiness, will only think of it with the bitter resentment of an alien dispossessed, and dispossessed by a soldier. How improbable that after this he should speak of the same woods, fields and springs with a pensive regret, envying their good fortune in still possessing the maiden of his love, and picturing their pleasure when she chants his verses, presses her limbs on the grass, or picks the still green grape, unripened as yet by the suns of autumn. Such a mood, with the rest of the soliloquy following, would be impossible as a *sequel* to the other, if the fields where Lydia wanders alone in the fragment are the fields where she lived with Cato, as described in the curse. Näke seems right in concluding that, if the scene of the *Dirae* is, as it appears *prima facie*, the scene of the *Lydia*, the latter was written first. There is, however, nothing to prove this, and it must remain a conjecture. Yet it may be thought to have this in its favor, that so read and in this order, the two poems are harmonious.

Assume, however, that the locale of the two is *not* the same; Näke's view will still stand unshaken. The Lydia of the fragment is a mere girl, still immature; the Lydia of the *Dirae* is a woman, with whom the poet has long cohabited, and the memory of whom will survive her death.

It would seem to follow from this that the *Lydia* was written when the poet was quite young. For, in spite of the counter-arguments of Näke, Suetonius' words *ipse libello, cui est titulus Indignatio, ingenuum se natum ait et pupillum relictum, eoque facilius licentia sullani temporis exutum patrimonio*, connect the loss of his estate with the fact that he was left a minor; and if he was under fourteen or fifteen when he was ousted from his patri-

mony, he must have been younger when he first formed an attachment to Lydia. Without pressing Suetonius' words to this extent, we may perhaps suppose that extreme youth prevented him from asserting his rightful claims in the first instance, and that when the matter came to be decided legally, and a verdict was pronounced against him (*O male deuoti praetorum crimina agelli*), he was not powerful enough to get it set aside: though the *Indignatio* (a prose work, I think, rather than a poem as Näge believed), which he published some time after his spoliation, proves that he did not submit to be dispossessed without some show of resistance.

I must pause here to consider the sceptical views of Merkel and K. F. Hermann, each of whom denies the justice of Scaliger's ascription of the two poems to Valerius Cato.

1. *External arguments.* Suetonius says Cato lost his patrimony by the licence of the times of Sulla. This means *not* that he was turned out of his lands by a soldier, but lost his property by some forensic chicanery, or the artifices of a Chrysogonus.

To which we may reply, that lands might be included in patrimony, and that in the countless acts of spoliation which attended Sulla's proscriptions, the *mode* of robbery was not always the same. Possibly Cato's father was proscribed; then his property would be put up to auction, and bought at a nominal sum by some centurion or officer in Sulla's interest.

2. There is no evidence that Cato wrote a *Dirae* at all. This of course proves nothing. Suetonius *implies* that Cato wrote other poems besides his *Lydia* and *Diana*. Conceivably our *Dirae* formed part of the *Indignatio*.

3. If the poetry of Cato belonged to the earlier Ciceronian epoch, why should Ovid mention it with the later generation, Cinna, Anser, Cornificius, i. e. the contemporaries of Catullus?

Obviously because poetically he was associated with the *new* school, not with the old. We know this from the eulogies passed on his poems by Ticia and Cinna.

2. *Internal objections.* As a *pupillus* Cato could neither have been in love with Lydia, nor be called *uetus dominus* of the farm, nor have written several poems already.

But Prof. J. E. B. Mayor's note on Juv. XI 156 is enough to show that *pupillaris* nearly = *nequam*, and the scholion there shows why: the loss of a father necessarily weakens the control which the maturing passions of an Italian boy demand. And how many boys have written love-poems! who can say when Catullus

first broke into song? or when Byron scribbled his first rhymes? As to *ueteris domini* the poet may mean not himself but his father. Or again the *Dirae* may have received its final shape long after the events which caused it were recent.

To these objections of Merkel and K. F. Hermann, Haupt and Lachmann added two others drawn from the language. Näke in his most erudite review of the particularities of style in the *Dirae* and *Lydia* fragment dwells much on the transference of *et, quom* in such cases as *arboribus coniungat et ardor aristas Sidera per uiridem redeunt quom pallida mundum Militis impia quom succaedet dextera ferro*, doubting whether to regard this phenomenon as part of an ancient simplicity of style or a metrical convenience. Haupt in his *Observationes Criticae*, p. 47, published in 1841, six years before Näke's posthumous edition, calls attention to the same point, the transference of *et* and *atque* *Dir.* 43, 110; *Lyd.* 56 *Istius atque utinam facti mea culpa magistra Prima foret*, and having shown that such transference is not found in Cicero's *Aratea*, only five times in Lucretius, and in Catullus not at all, takes occasion to object to Scaliger's ascription of the two poems to Cato, and agrees with Merkel in believing them to be by another poet, and written in 713-41 when Octavius was distributing lands to his veterans. Lachmann, on *Lucr.* IV 604, draws a similar conclusion from the trajection of *namque* in *Lyd.* 12, *Dulci namque tumet nondum uitecula Baccho*.

Such reasonings, in the loss of so much poetical literature as we know to have existed, are necessarily unconvincing. We have not all even that Catullus wrote; most of Cicero's later poems have perished; of Bibaculus and Varro of Atax the merest fragments survive: the utmost we can fairly infer from what we have is that in the poetry we possess up to the deaths of Catullus and Lucretius (roughly we may say up to 50 B. C.) such transference of particles is rare. But then the style of the *Dirae* and *Lydia* is, as Näke shows at length, peculiar and exceptional; the very form and matter of the *Dirae* is unique. Surely Näke's view, to regard such transferences of particles as marks of idiosyncrasy, of a specific genius which must have its own forms of expression, to note and classify them, without pronouncing that they belong to a time twenty or thirty years earlier or later, is the sane, indeed the only logical procedure.

I have tried to show that the poem or series of poems to which the *Lydia* fragment belongs was prompted by a real passion and

written before it subsided. Coeval with the *Lydia* were other poems written at the same early period: these he taught Lydia to sing, at first to himself: in the fragment she is described as conning them alone and then singing them aloud to the fields and wood which he could no longer share with her.

Et mea summissa meditatur carmina uoce  
Cantat et interea mihi quae cantabat in aurem.

Näke thought these other poems were also amatory; but this is more than can be proved, though in itself very likely. They may have been included in the collective *Lydia*, which as we saw above possessed qualities that drew upon it the sustained study of learned critics. Whether the original form was what we now have it is difficult to say. It is not impossible that the first draught of the *Lydia*, which must have been a very early work, was re-written when Cato had matured his powers by reading and lecturing on poetry as a *litterator* at Rome. Neither the *Dirae* nor the *Lydia* fragment are specially fine. Ovid goes the length even of calling Cato's poetry *leue opus*, classing it as such with the verses of Cornificius (*Trist.* II 436). It must have been friendship or perhaps Cato's wide celebrity which made Furius Bibaculus call him not only *unicum magistrum* and *summum grammaticum*, but also *optimum poetam*. Or (and this is a more solid hypothesis), the mythological learning which even in its abridged form the *Lydia* exhibits, was at that time fashionable as part of the reaction against the older Roman poetry, and as ranking their author with the rising school, which looked to Catullus as its greatest exponent, to Calvus, Cinna and Cornificius as inferior representatives. With Catullus Cato was intimately associated, if we adopt the prevailing view that it was to him that the well-known hendecasyllables were addressed, *O rem ridiculam Cato et iocosam, Dignamque auribus et tuo cachinno*. I have argued at some length against this in my Commentary: though it can count in the list of its adherents Achilles Statius, Scaliger and Ribbeck: and it is undeniable that the *auribus et cachinno* would agree with the description of Valerius Cato which Suetonius has quoted from his contemporary and friend Furius Bibaculus *En cor Zenodoti, en iecur Cratetis* and the distich perhaps also by Bibaculus

Cato grammaticus Latina Siren  
Qui solus legit ac facit poetas.

In the *Dirae* mythology plays no great rôle; it was in the *Lydia*, as our fragment is enough amply to show, probably even more in the *Diana* or *Dictynna* (Näke thought the poem may have had both names, and conjectured that part of the matter it treated was a disquisition on the meaning and connexion of the two) that the poet-grammarian displayed his stores of erudition: just as the author of the *Ciris* dwells lovingly on the legend of Britomartis, and informs us how some called her Aphaea, while others gave one of her names, Dictynna, to the Moon. In the *Lydia* the words *tauro Ioue digna uel auro* allude to Jove's wooing Europa and Danae in the disguise of a bull and a gold-shower; in 40 the passion of Luna for Endymion, in 43 of Apollo for Daphne, in 44-47 the numerous loves of the gods for mortals are briefly summed up in the vv.

Omnia uos estis: secum sua gaudia gestat

Aut inspersa videt mundo, quae dicere longum est.

In 48 the Golden Age and the happiness of heroic love is contrasted with the wretched conditions of passion in the poet's own time: Ariadne and Medea are felicitated. Lastly, the union of Jupiter with Juno on Mount Ida, and Aurora's passion for Cephalus are described.

Let us now look at Cato's management of the hexameter. If my arguments at the outset were just, Cato's *Lydia* was composed (or at least the first draught of it) before the Sullan proscriptions of 82 B. C. Ten years later, in 72, Catullus was fifteen, but if we follow the opinion of most critics, his hexameter epyllion on the nuptials of Peleus and Thetis was not written before 60. Vergil's earliest Eclogues are not earlier than 43 B. C. These, with Cicero's *Aratea* and *de Consul. Suo* and Lucretius' didactic poem *De Rerum Natura* are the only remains of sufficient length (putting aside as uncertain the *Culex Ciris Moretum*) to allow of comparison. I will speak of special points and (omitting Lucretius as standing apart) first elision. In 80 vv. of Cicero's *Aratea* (237-317) I counted twenty-eight elisions of all kinds; in the first eighty of the *Peleus and Thetis* twenty-three; in the eighty-three vv. of Vergil's first Eclogue there are seventeen, in the seventy-three of Ecl. II twenty-five, in the sixty-three of Ecl. IV only thirteen. In the *Lydia* fragm. I counted in eighty verses seventeen elisions. But it is a most noticeable point in these that instead of being multiform, i. e. of long and short vowels or *-um* indifferently, no

less than ten of them are elided before *est*, in four the last syllable of *atque* is elided, and the remaining three are all short syllables, *quæ laederet gaudiâ*. Judging therefore by the *Lydia* fragm. alone, we may say that the laws of elision are more strict than in any of the other poets. Turning to the *Dirae* we find even greater strictness. In the first eighty verses there are only nine; though four of them are elisions of long syllables: in the whole 103 verses there are twenty. One entire segment of the poem (a phenomenon which I have noticed also in the *Cynegetica* of Nemesianus) is without any, 8-44; though there are reasons for believing that some verses are lost between thirty-four and thirty-five, and the calculation is therefore a little uncertain. One specialty of elision, common to both the poems, has been noticed by Nâke, I mean the elision of the last syllable of a dactylic word before a bacchius at the end of the verse. Nâke enumerates eight instances, *libera auena, impia agellos, flumina amica, aduena arator, crimina agelli, Battare auena, gaudia habetis, ludere in herba*. A similar dactylic elision occurs at the outset of one verse of the *Dirae*, *Dulcia amara prius fient*. Nâke says this peculiarity of rhythm could not have happened so often in so short a poem had the writer belonged to the new school. I think, myself, whatever school of poetry Cato may have been thought to have belonged to, that this special ending betrays early composition. It may therefore be taken as a metrical argument of some cogency in favor of Scaliger's hypothesis.

2. *Caesura*. Both the poems in this respect show a still undeveloped skill. The beginning of the *Lydia* fragment may be taken as a fair specimen of the rhythm throughout. The predominance of the penthemimeral caesura is marked and produces a monotonous effect. Verses like

- 69 Nam certe Volcanus opus faciebat et illi  
 75 Ergo quod deus atque heros, cur non minor aetas  
 76 Infelix ego, non illo qui tempore natus  
 77 Quo facilis natura fuit. Sors o mea laeua.

are rare. The Bucolic caesura, in which the fourth foot is a dactyl and ends a word, occurs in its strictest form four times,

- 22 At male tabescunt morientia membra dolore  
 33 Siue tibi siluis noua pabula fastidire  
 47 Aurea quin etiam quom saecula uoluebantur  
 67 Purpureos flores quos insuper accumbebat

in all of which the fourth dactyl is either one word or the last part of one; in its broken form, i. e. in which the dactyl is made up of two words, it is pretty frequent: there are thirteen cases in eighty lines.

Siue libet campis, tecum tua laeta capella est  
Omnia uos estis, secum sua gaudia gestat

may be taken as types. In this respect the *Dirae* marks an advance on the *Lydia* fragment,

Rura quibus diras indiximus, impia uota  
Haec Veneris uario florentiaserta decore  
Dulcia non oculis, non auribus ulla ferantur  
Monstra repentinis terrentia saepe figuris  
Piscetur nostris in finibus aduena arator  
Dulcia rura ualete et Lydia dulcior illis  
Tardius a miserae descendite monte capellae  
Rura ualete iterum tuque optima Lydia salue

alternate with the broken form sufficiently often to prove that Cato had made a considerable study of Theocritus. It is, however, very noticeable that the spondeiazon which is found three times in the *Lydia*, always with a pleasing effect, is entirely absent from the *Dirae*. The reason may probably be found in the denunciatory tone of the greater part of it; it is only in the concluding verses that the poet strikes into a softer note.

Compare this with the first 180 lines of the *Peleus and Thetis*. In these the bucolic caesura occurs twenty times, preferably in the strict form, and that usually followed by a spondee in the fifth foot *Nereides admirantes, flagrantia declinauit, carmine compellabo*, once by a dactyl and spondee in one word, *flexibus egredientem*, a freedom which Cato has nowhere permitted himself. For a moment, indeed, the excessive recurrence in Catullus of the rhythm *prognatae uertice pinus*, might almost seem to give to Cato the advantage of variety in rhythm. But on attentive examination it will, I think, be felt that Catullus has the advantage even here, as of course in all the essential qualities which distinguish the great poet from the versifier.

*Peleus and Thetis*, 71-79:

A misera, assiduis quam luctibus externauit  
Spinosas Erycina serens in pectore curas,  
Illa tempestate, ferox quo ex tempore Theseus  
Egressus curuis e litoribus Piraei  
Attigit iniusti regis Cortinia tecta.

Nam perhibent olim crudeli peste coactam  
 Androgeoneae poenas exoluere caedis  
 Electos iuuenes simul et decus innuptarum  
 Cecropiam solitam esse dapem dare Minotauro.

Here the favorite rhythm does not occur at all, and every one of the other verses is distinct from its neighbor.

There is, however, one point, and one only, in which the two poems of Cato can contrast favorably even with Catullus. Read through the *Peleus and Thetis*, and you will be astonished to find in how many cases the pause of the sentence or clause coincides with the end of the verse. This is particularly observable at the beginning of the poem, but throughout it marks a point of immature development. Whereas in the *Lydia* already in v. 3 the sentence is continued and completed from the previous line, *mea quod formosa puella Euobis tacite nostrum suspirat amorem*. So in vv. 13 and 14, 24, 25, 26, 27,

non ulla puella  
 Doctior in terris fuit aut formosior: ac si  
 Fabula non uana est, tauro Ioue digna uel auro,  
 Iuppiter auertas aurem, mea sola puella est.

and indeed throughout both the poems. It would be perhaps hazardous to conclude too much from this, yet it may induce us to be more sceptical in assenting to the supposed late date of the *Peleus and Thetis*. The influence of Cicero's *Aratea* seems to some extent still perceptible; and this it could hardly have been if it was written as late as 56 or 54 B. C.

I will now enumerate some points which the laborious erudition of Näke has collected as attesting an early style. Many, but not all of them, fall under what he calls *antiqua simplicitas*.

(1) Repetition of the same words or types of expression in different parts of either poem at short intervals.

Dir. 20. Veneris uario florentia sarta decore

Lyd. 13. inter uarios Venerem stipantia flores

Membra reclinarit

Lyd. 14. illiserit herbam

66. elidere in herba Purpureos flores

Lyd. 37. Cur non et nobis facilis natura fuisset?

77. Quo facilis natura fuit

Lyd. 48. Condicio similis fuerat mortalibus illis

52. Condicio nobis uitae

- Lyd. 58. Dulcia cum Veneris furatus gaudia primus  
 65. Gaudia libauit dulcem furatus amorem  
 so *felix, formosus, umbrae* recur again and again.  
 Dir. 10. felicia rura  
 33. felicia ligna  
 90. felix nomen agelli  
 Dir. 27. formosis uirectis  
 32. Formosae umbrae  
 Lyd. 1, 2. Inuideo uobis agri, formosaque prata  
 Hoc formosa magis, mea quod formosa puella  
 E uobis, etc.  
 24. non ulla puella Doctior in terris fuit aut formosior  
 Dir. 43. diffusus  
 49. diffunditis  
 51. perfundat  
 63. infundimus  
 65. diffundite  
 77. diffuso  
 (2) Double epithets.  
 Dir. 92. Mollia non iterum carpetis pabula nota.  
 Cf. Cat. LXVI, Illius a mala dona leuis bibat irrita puluis.  
 Under this head may be reckoned  
 Dir. 16, 17. Pallida flauescant aestu sitientia prata  
 Inmatura cadant ramis pendentia mala.  
 (3) Juxtaposition of substantive and epithet.  
 Dir. 42. Vicinae flammae rapiant ex ordine uites  
 97. Extremum carmen repetamus Battare auena.  
 Lyd. 11. Aut roseis digitis uiridem decerpserit uuam.  
 (4) Peculiar or unnatural position of words.  
*non.*  
 Dir. 13. Ipsae non siluae frondes, non pampinus uuas.  
 Compare with this  
 Cul. 26. tibi namque canit non pagina bellum  
 Cul. 29. Urit Erichthonias Oriens non ignibus arces  
*et.*  
 arboribus coniungat et ardor aristas.

Also in the Culex 51

Pendula proiectis carpuntur et arbuta ramis

which, however, must be later in composition. In Propertius this trajection of *et* is very frequent. Näke quotes six certain examples,

six from Tibullus. Though therefore a specialism in the *Dirae* and *Lydia*, it is a sign not of archaic style, but of the style which was coming in.

*quom.*

Lyd. 39. Sidera per uiridem redeunt quom pallida mundum.

47. Aurea quin etiam quom saecula uoluebantur.

Dir. 31. Militis impia quom succaedet dextera ferro.

Very little stress can be laid on this, which is simply the effort of poetry to throw off the yoke of prose.

*qui.* The simple old connective use of *qui* stands on a very different footing. It is a distinct sign of archaism of poetry still not sufficiently marked off from prose. In the *Dirae* one instance occurs—

78. imbres, Qui dominis infesta minantes stagna relinquunt.  
In the *Culex* it forms a marked feature.

Cul. 109-112.

Delia diua, tuo, quo quondam uicta furore  
Venit Nyctelium fugiens Cadmeis Agaue  
Infandas scelerata manus et caede cruenta  
*Quae* gelidis bacchata iugis requieuit in antro.

Cul. 120. Ipsa loci natura domum resonante susurro  
*Quis* dabat.

Cul. 143. Quis aderat ueteris myrtus non nescia fati.

Cul. 168. ecfert Sublimi ceruice caput: *cui* crista superne.

Two other points, also observed by Näke: (1) *Parenthesis*, (2) *Apostrophe*, belong also to a newer and a freer style, and are in no way archaic.

(1) Dir. 35.

Iuppiter (ipse

Iuppiter hanc aluit) cinis haec tibi fiat oportet.

Dir. 66. Nil est quod perdam ulterius—maris omnia—diris.

Lyd. 26, 27.

tauro Ioue digna uel auro

Iuppiter auertas aurem—mea sola puella est.

(2) *Apostrophe* may almost be called the most marked feature of the *Dirae*, as is natural in a curse. It falls into two genera.

(1) The address in the vocative of the objects cursed, the fields, the wood of Lydia; of the objects by which the curse is to be effected, the rivers and sea-waters, the objects which the poet removes with him at his departure, his cattle and goats.

- (2) Change from third person of prose narrative to second of poetry.

Dir. 8. dicam tua facta, Lycurge,

15. sulci condatis auenas.

83. Tuque inimica tui semper discordia ciuis.

Some of these points show the author of the *Dirae* and *Lydia* as still under early influences, others as making a departure to a newer, more absolutely poetic style. There is, I believe, nothing which conclusively militates with the view of Scaliger, that the two poems (at least in their earliest form) belonged to the *former* half of the last century of the Republic. And if this is so, we may estimate the excessive unhappiness of the Sullan proscriptions; for poetry, with the ancients, did not often take the form of a solemn curse; and the only perfect specimen besides the *Dirae* which has descended to us, the *Ibis* of Ovid, records one of the deepest tragedies which has ever befallen a great poet. Whatever we may think of Cato's success in his cursing—for my own part I would not compare it for an instant with the *Ibis*—the choice of that *form* must, I think, point to a real indignation that can only have been prompted by a real wrong. If Ribbeck in his recently published *History of Roman Poetry* (I, p. 311) can bring himself to believe that Cato was recalled by the triumviral division of lands in 41 B. C. to the memory of his own dispossession forty years before, and wrote his *Dirae* then, at a period when his powers were matured, nature and reason, I imagine, are alike against him. It must have been when the outrage was still recent, that the poem first took shape, though there is nothing to prevent its being recast and re-edited later. As little can I feel anything like improvisation in its structure. The facility of a Statius who could throw off most of his *Silvae* in a single day, the longest of them in two, is utterly absent. The poet has at best but a thin vein of poetry, and that he seems to have cultivated to the best of his ability.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

## II.—ON THE SENTENCE-QUESTION IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE.

### *Second Paper.*

#### I. *nonne.*

The theory that *nonne* was not used by Pl. was proposed by A. Spengel, *Die Partikel "nonne" im Altlateinischen*, Progr. München, 1867. His grounds are three: First, as "*ne* = *nonne*" and *non* express sufficiently all shades of negative questioning, *nonne* would be superfluous. Second, it is *a priori* probable that the copyists changed *non* in some cases into *nonne*, and this accounts for the cases where *nonne* is given in the MSS. Third, the cases given are all but one before a vowel. This one is metrically incorrect, and the demands of sense and metre are satisfied by *non* wherever *nonne* occurs.

These arguments are answered in detail by Schrader, *de particularum -ne, anne, nonne apud Plautum prosodia*, pp. 42-46. First, the early and colloquial Latin is full of double and triple expressions for practically identical ideas, e. g. *rogas? me rogas? men rogas? tun rogas?* Moreover, there must have been a time when "*ne* = *nonne*" and *non* were still in use, while *nonne* was beginning to crowd in by the side of them. The only question is whether this had already begun in the time of Pl. Second, not only *nonne* but *anne* also is found in Pl. only before vowels. The explanation of this fact must apply to both cases, not, as does Spengel's, to *nonne* alone, and is to be found in the very light effect of *-nē*, which caused its shortening in nearly all possible cases to *-n*. See the evidence in Schrader, especially the table on p. 37, showing the preference of Pl. for *ne* before vowels. Omitting words ending in *s*, there are in Pl. only 28 cases where *ne* both follows and precedes a vowel. Schrader gives a full list of the passages where the MSS support *nonne*, which need not be repeated here. Ter. uses it in Ad. 660, Andr. 238, 239, 647, 869, Eun. 165, 334, 736, Heaut. 545, 922, Hec. 552, Ph. 768.

The distinction in sense between *non* and *nonne*, which Kühner, II 1011, 1, attempts to make, is valueless for Pl. and Ter., at least.

K. RELATIVES WITH *ne*.

See Lor., Most.<sup>2</sup> 738, Brix, Trin.<sup>2</sup> 360, Spengel, Andr. 768, Warren on *ne*, Amer. Journ. Philol. II, pp. 79-80.

Relatives with *ne* divide themselves into two classes, according as the antecedent is or is not expressed in the same sentence.

(a). The antecedent is not expressed. Most. 738, *ventus navem nostram deseruit. || quid est? quo modo? || pessumo. || quaene subducta erat tuto in terram?* Curc. 705, . . . *ne quisquam a me argentum auferat. || quodne promisti? || promisi? qui?* Similar to these are Amph. 697, Epid. 719, Mil. 13, Rud. 861, 1019, 1231, Truc. 506, Andr. 768, Ph. 923. The following have the subjunctive in the relative clause, independently of the question, but are otherwise like the preceding: Bacch. 332, Merc. 573, Mil. 973 (MSS *quae*), Trin. 360. In Epid. 449 *quemne* is an early conjecture for *nempe quem*, adopted on metrical grounds.

Here belong also a few cases with other relative words. Bacch. 257, *dei quattuor scelestiorem nullum inluxere alterum. || quamne Archidemidem? || quam, inquam, Archidemidem.* Most. 1132, *ego ibo pro te, si tibi non lubet. || verbero, etiam inrides? || quian me pro te ire ad cenam autumo?* Also with *quiane* Pers. 851. Truc. 696 is a very probable emendation by Spengel.

With these go the few cases of *utin*.<sup>1</sup> Rud. 1063, *animum advorte ac tace. || utin istic prius dicat?* Merc. 576, *tu ausculere mulierem? utine adveniēns vomitum excutias mulieri?* Hec. 66, *et moneo et hortor, ne quousquam misereat, . . . || utine eximium neminem habeam? || neminem.* Hec. 199, Ph. 874, Epid. 225. The last is the only one lacking in clearness.

There are further two cases where *priusne quam* is used, which are closely allied to the preceding. Mil. 1005, *hercle vero iam adlubescit primum, Palaestrio. || priusne quam illam oculis vidisti?* Truc. 694, *is quidem hic apud nos est Strabax: modo rure venit. || priusne quam ad matrem suam?* Pl. 22 [23], Ter. 5.

These clauses are in their nature, aside from the use of *ne* or the interrogation, incomplete sentences. Some of them have the subjunctive of characteristic, which they could have only as clauses in themselves incomplete. Some few of them, e. g. Trin. 360 (*quin*), Epid. 225 (*utin*), might, if taken alone, be understood as complete sentences, but when all are put together and their simi-

<sup>1</sup> A fuller discussion of these clauses is given below in connection with the history of the interrogative sentence.

larity is noted, I cannot see how they can be regarded as anything else than ordinary relative clauses, separated from the main clause of the sentence. The hypothesis of an ellipsis is made necessary, therefore, not by the use of *ne* or its unusual connection with a relative, nor by the interrogation, but by the relative. And it is plain that *ne* is attached to the relative simply because the word to which it would naturally be appended is not in the sentence. Most. 738 would be *deseruitne ventus eam navem, quae*; Merc. 573, *idne non osculer quod amem*? Or more briefly *dicisne eam (id), quae (quod) . . .*? So in Epid. 107, *idne pudet te, quia captivam genere prognatam bono de praeda's mercatus*? might have been *quian*, if the other speaker had happened to say *pudet me*. So also Eun. 415, *eone es ferox, quia*.

These questions have in all but two or three cases a rather distinct tone of rejection. This arises from the fact that they supplement in an interrogative tone the statement of the other speaker. This may be done inquiringly, as in Bacch. 257, Mil. 13, or with astonishment, as in Epid. 719, without going so far as to express dissent. But the natural tendency of this, as of all supplementary questions (cf. Engl. "Do you mean . . .?" "Do you mean to say . . .?"), is to become corrective or repudiating. In this way these questions come very close to the corrective sense of *quin*, so that it may in certain passages be difficult to distinguish between them.

(b). In a few cases the relative clause precedes the leading clause, and the antecedent is either expressed or plainly implied. St. 501, *quaene eapse deciens in die mutat locum, eam auspicavi ego in re capitali mea*? Here the sentence is interrogative, but with the leading clause after the relative, and *ne* is simply appended to the first word of the sentence. Rud. 272, *quaene eiectae e mari sumus ambae, opsecro, unde nos hostias agere voluisti huc*? (*vis tibi huc*, Sch.) This is similar except that in the leading clause a new interrogative *unde* is introduced, by a second thought; that is, the sentence ends with an anacoluthon. In the same way I should explain Cist. IV 2, 6, *quamne in manibus tenui atque accepi hic ante aedis cistellam, ubi ea sit nescio*. Here the substituted second clause is, of course, not interrogative, but it is one which could easily be substituted for an interrogation. In Mil. 614, *quodne vobis placeat, displiceat mihi*? Lor.<sup>2</sup> omits *ne* because there is no example of such a use of *ne* except where a demonstrative or personal pronoun follows in the main clause. But we are dealing here with unusual and infrequent forms of sentence,

and it seems to me that it is by no means necessary that they should be alike in all points. The only essential is that the relative clause should precede; if Pl. could write *quod vobis placeat, displaceat mihi*? as Ribbeck and Lor. read, then he could write *quodne vobis*, etc.

Beside these there are some passages where *qui-ne* is used after the leading clause. My collection of examples is not, I fear, complete on this point, nor have I any new explanation to offer except such general suggestion as comes in the line of the remarks to follow upon the extent and variety of the uses of *ne*. Truc. 533 is classed by Lor. (Most.<sup>2</sup> 738) with Catull. LXIV 180, 182 f., as a continuation; rightly, as I think. On Rud. 767 I should agree with Kienitz on *quin*, p. 2, in thinking *quin(e) ut* impossible. For Cist. IV 1, 1 f. I know neither parallel nor explanation. On Ad. 261 f. see Dz. Krit. Anh., the ed. with notes.

#### ON *ne* WITH APPARENT NEGATIVE SENSE.

Questions of this kind, in which, as it is commonly expressed, *ne* = *nonne*, are given by Holtze, II 256 ff., in the list of questions with *ne*, but without explanation. Kühner, II 1002, gives a short list of places where *ne* expects an affirmative answer, saying in the index "scheinbar statt *nonne*," but giving no explanation. Hand, Turs. IV 74, gives a partial explanation, but as he starts from the thesis that *ne* has everywhere an appreciable negative force, he says only that *ne* is here a briefer expression for *nonne*. In the commentaries, where the usage is noticed (Bx. on Men. 284, Lor. on Ps. 340), a few illustrations are given. The only real attempt to explain this kind of question is made by Professor Warren in his article "On the enclitic *ne* in early Latin," Am. Jour. of Philol., II, pp. 50-82. After quoting comments of grammarians on *vidin*, *dixin*, etc., he says "I infer that to them [the Latin grammarians] the negative force of *ne* [in *vidin*, *dixin*] is as clear and sharp as the negation in *can't*, *won't*, etc., is clear to an English speaker." In other words, as the context shows, this usage is to be regarded as a survival of the original negative sense of *ne*. The problem of the origin of the *ne*-question will be taken up later, in connection with the general history of the interrogative sentence; this seems a fitting point, however, to gather together the cases in which *ne* has the effect of *nonne*.

They are these: *sumne*, mostly with a relative clause, *videon* (?), *vincon* (?), *possumne* (?), *cognōscin* (?), *scin* in a few cases, *viden*

with infin. and perhaps in some cases with *ut* clause, *facitne*, *faciuntne*, *videturne* (?), *estne* in certain cases, the perf. indic. first sing. except one case, *dixtin*, *iuravistin* (no others in perf. second pers.), possibly two or three in perf. indic. third pers., the impf. subjunctive in apodosis, and possibly two or three with *satin*.

These have been commented upon as they came up, and it has been shown in detail that they are always attended by some circumstance or expression which of itself shows that an affirmative answer is expected. This attendant circumstance may be asserted by a phrase in the question, or it may be obvious from the action or situation of the speaker. *sumne* has a rel. clause, Merc. 588, *sumne ego homo miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere?* "Am I not a wretched man? I can never be at rest!" *sumne ibi?* (Rud. 865) "I said I'd be at Venus' temple; am I there?" = "Am I not there?" because he was standing in plain sight in front of the temple. *viden* with infin. asks in *viden* and answers in the infin. Capt. 595, "His body is spotted all over! Don't you see it?" With an *ut* clause, which is less definite than the infin. (see Bx. Trin. 1046 on the difference in independent questions), the *nonne* effect is also less clear. Verbs in the third sing. pres. indic. are almost invariably neutral; the question is genuine; but *facitne* (Amph. 526) has the effect of *nonne*. The full question is *facitne ut dixi?* "I said he would do it. Isn't he doing it?" So the perf. indic. first sing., not simply with *vidin*, *dixin*, *edixin*, but in every case but one (*dixin*, Cist. 251 Uss.), contains an assertion in itself and demands an acknowledgment rather than an answer.

Beside these cases in which the *nonne* effect is rather clear, there are others in which it is less distinct. Some of these are marked in the list with a question mark. Thus, *vincon*, Amph. 433, may be either "Am I proving my point?" or "Am I not proving . . . ?" The questions indicating recognition, *videon* and *estne hic meus sodalis*, etc., may be taken either way, according as the recognition is more or less complete. *estne haec tua domus?* is a question for information, because there was nothing to show whether it was *tua domus* or not; *estne haec manus?* (Pers. 225) means "Isn't this a hand?" because the hand was violently thrust into view. *sumne apud me?* Mil. 1345, spoken by a person just recovering from a (pretended) swoon, means "Am I in my senses?" If it were used in angry argument it might be spoken with such a tone and manner as to make it mean "Am I not in full possession of my reason?" So *dixin* is the standing example of *ne = nonne*, but in Cist. 251 Uss. (Fragm. 27, Ben.) we have *haec tu*

*pervorsa omnia mihi fabulatu's. || dixin ego istaec, obsecro? || modo quidem hercle haec dixisti.* Here the half-dazed speaker really does not know whether he had said it or not, and so *dixin* means "did I say that?" and could not possibly mean "didn't I say that?"

Further, there are questions like those already cited, having the same degree of *nonne* effect, but not having *ne*. They will be found below under IV G. Examples are And. 423, *sum verus?* (cf. Rud. 865, *sumne ibi?*), Eun. 532, *dico ego mi insidias fieri?* Even in *quis* questions a similar effect may be produced, e. g. Asin. 521, *quid ais tu? . . . quotiens te votui Argyrippum filium Demaeneti compellare . . . ?* which is very nearly "Haven't I often forbidden . . . ?"

It seems clear that we have to do here with a shading or tone, which is not always associated with *ne* and therefore cannot be produced by it, but which is always associated with certain attendant circumstances and varies in intensity as these circumstances vary. If the *nonne* effect were really a negation, due to the negative force of *ne*, there could be no half-tones, no cases about which there would be any doubt as to the presence of the *nonne* effect. But in fact the same form passes through various gradations of meaning: *estne frater intus? estne tibi nomen Menaechmo? estne hic meus sodalis? estne haec manus?* Between *dixin* and *dixin* there is nothing like the gap that there is between *can* and *can't* in declarative sentences. If, however, we turn to English interrogative sentences and compare, e. g. "Can I help you?" with "Can't I help you?" we see that, though one question starts from the affirmation and the other from the negation, they have both approached neutrality of meaning, so that we can imagine circumstances which would permit the use of either. But if *can* and *can't*, in spite of their different forms, may be used almost indifferently in questions, much more must *estne* and *estne*, alike in form and origin, have seemed to a Roman identical, even though the circumstances may have given them slightly varying shades of meaning. It seems to me, therefore, quite erroneous to hold that the "*ne* = *nonne*" questions are distinctly negative in sense; rather they are neutral questions, with very slight (possibly negative) shading, used in circumstances where the modern idiom employs the neutral-negative question. Later I hope to show that *dixin* = "didn't I say?" is not in reality more immediately connected with the original *nē* than is *dixin* = "did I say?"

II. *num*.

Of all the interrogative particles *num* and *an* are the most difficult.

In regard to the etymology of *num* two distinct opinions are held. One (e. g. Corssen, Kühner, Landgraf Reisig-Haase, III, p. 301, note) is that *num* is the accus. sing. masc. of the pronominal stem *no-* and bears the same relation to *nunc* as *tum* to *tunc*. The other (Ribbeck, Lat. Partik., p. 12, Stolz-Schmalz, p. 299) is that *num* contains the negative *ne* and means "nicht zu irgend einer Zeit." This seems to be connected in the Stolz-Schmalz grammar (p. 298) with a theory that all questions except the disjunctive necessarily contain a negative word.

In regard to the meaning also of questions with *num*, there is a considerable variety of opinion, though it is usually said that *num* expects a negative answer. Kühner, as usual, appears to test the answer expected by the answer received, an error upon which I have commented before. One reason for the uncertainty in regard to *num* is that it has no special sets of phrases connected with certain verbs or certain persons or numbers, like *sumne*, *ain*, *vin*. Except *numquid vis* and *num moror* it has formed no idioms which could serve as a starting-point for investigation. It would therefore be useless to divide *num* questions according to the person and tense of the verb, as was done with *ne*, and the only course left is to note the leading tendencies of meaning, applying such tests as the context furnishes, and remembering that the results must necessarily be somewhat uncertain. In doing this one must take some pains to rid himself of the inclination, which we get from familiarity with the classical Latin, to attach to *num* the idea of a negative answer, and must endeavor to look at each case without bias.

(a). There are many cases where the context shows that the speaker could not possibly have held the negative opinion or have expected a negative answer. Amph. 1073, *numnam hunc percussit Iuppiter? credo edepol*. Andr. 477, *num immemores discipuli?* ("Your pupils have forgotten your instructions; haven't they?") Aul. 389, *strepitust intus. numnam ego confilor miser?* Andr. 591, *hem, numnam perimus?* Eun. 947, *quae illaec turbast? numnam ego perii?* Aul. 242, *sed pro Iuppiter, num ego disperii?* (Müll. Pros. 305, *nunc*). Men. 608, *num ancillae aut servi tibi responsant? eloquere: inpune non erit*. Men. 413, *pro Iuppiter, num istaec mulier illinc (from Syracuse) venit, quae*

*te novit tam cate?* Amph. 620, . . . *quid ais? num abdormivisti dudum?* || *nusquam gentium.* || *ibi forte istum si vidisses quendam in somnis Sosiam.* (So Goetz-Loewe.) Other sure cases are Amph. 709, 753, Cist. IV 1, 6, Poen. 976, Eun. 286, Heaut. 517.

While the context shows that the speaker in several if not in all of these held the affirmative opinion, this does not anywhere appear to be so distinctly expressed as to make it possible to put *nonne* in the place of *num*. They seem rather like neutral questions: "Has Jupiter struck him? I really believe he has!" "What a noise there is! Am I getting robbed?"

Pl. 10, Ter. 5.

(b). In some cases the question is clearly asked for information. Men. 890, *num larvatust aut cerritus? fac sciam. num eum veturnus aut aqua intercus tenet?* This is asked by a physician who wants to know his patient's symptoms. Merc. 173, after a vague but disquieting announcement of misfortune, a father whose son is at sea asks, *obsecro, num navis periit?* || *salvast navis.* Asin. 31, *dic serio, quod te rogem . . . num me illuc ducis ubi lapis lapidem terit?* Merc. 215, *num esse amicam suspicari visus est?* Other passages are similar to these, but I have preferred to give only those where the context makes the inquiring tone clear beyond question.

In the following cases the context does not forbid the negative sense, nor does it require it. If it is presumed on the evidence of the later usage that *num* requires a negative answer, these questions would not be inconsistent with the rule; if it can be shown that *num* is properly neutral in sense, there is nothing to prevent these cases from being so understood. They are Asin. 619, Aul. 161, Bacch. 212, Cas. II 6, 32, V 2, 31, 54, Capt. 658, Merc. 131, Mil. 924, Most. 336, 905, 1109, Poen. 1079, 1258, 1315, Rud. 235, 1304, Truc. 546, 602, Ad. 487, 697, Andr. 438, 971, Eun. 756, 829, Ph. 846. In Men. 612, Rud. 830 there is perhaps an inclination toward the negative.

Pl. 27, Ter. 7.

(c). Rather sharply distinguished from the preceding uses is the use of *num* in sentences which, like "*ne* = *nonne*," challenge the hearer to acknowledge something which the dialogue or the action makes evident. This is always a negative, but it is not quite accurate to say that *num* here "expects a negative answer." It challenges the hearer to deny, if he can, but the denial is not waited for. Capt. 632, *meam rem non cures, si recte facias. num ego curo tuam?* Men. 606, *potin ut . . . molestus ne sis? num te appello?* Precisely similar to these is *num moror?* "I'm not

delaying, am I?" Curc. 365, Most. 794.<sup>1</sup> Cf. *numquid moror?* Epid. 681, *quid me quaeris? ecce me! num te fugi? num ab domo absum? num oculis concessi a tuis?* Heaut. 793, 794 (twice) is similar. Also with the first pers., Ps. 220, Men. 565, Mil. 291, Truc. 379, Heaut. 738, Ph. 411, 524.

With second pers. less frequent. And. 496, 578, and probably Eun. 854. I find no cases in Pl.

With the third pers. Curc. 94, *num mutit cardo? est lepidus.* Most. 345, *num mirum aut novom quippiam facit?* "There's nothing remarkable in his being drunk, is there?" Truc. 352, *num tibi nam amabo ianuast mordax mea, . . . ?* "You don't suppose my door will bite, do you?" softened by *nam* and *amabo*. Ps. 1289, Asin. 576, Poen. 866, Andr. 366, 877, Eun. 163, 575, Heaut. 514, Hec. 707, Ph. 848. Pl. 17, Ter. 16.

The large proportion of these with the first person is noteworthy, as supporting the analogy with "*ne = nonne*." (Cf. *sumne, dixin*.) This analogy is further supported by the fact that the two kinds of question occur together, e. g. Rud. 865, *dixeram praesto fore. numquid muto? sumne ibi?*

#### *Numquis, numquid.*

Some of the same difficulties which attend the discussion of *num* appear also in *numquis*, and the arrangement is in general the same.

(a). In some cases the context shows that a negative expectation is improbable. Most. 999, *numquid processit ad forum hic hodie novi?* (cf. 1004) || *quid tu otiosus res novas requiritas?* Most. 1031, *perii, interii.* || *numquid Tranio turbavit?* Lor. transl. "Hat Tranio irgend einen Streich gespielt?" and the very mention of T. shows that Simo thinks him the probable source of trouble. Merc. 369, *sed istuc quid est, tibi quod commutatust color? numquid tibi dolet?* Bacch. 668, *numqui nummi, ere, tibi exciderunt, quod sic terram optuere?* Eun. 272, *numquidnam hic quod nolis vides? || te. || credo: at numquid aliud? || quidum?* (= What makes you think so?) || *quia tristi's.* Also Bacch. 538, Andr. 943.

<sup>1</sup> Kühner, II 1008, 2, translates this "soll ich noch bleiben?" taking this rendering with time-force apparently from Draeger, I 342, who perhaps took it from Haud. IV 319. In Curc. 365 the preceding words are *eamus nunc intro, ut tabellas consignemus?* after which *num moror?* could not possibly mean "soll ich noch bleiben?" Nor is this sense any better in Most. 794.

The negative opinion is not so entirely impossible here as it is in some cases with *num*, but it is unlikely. I think it may be said that no one would suppose that these questions required a negative answer, if he took them by themselves, apart from the influence of later usage, as should of course be done.

The following cases are less clear: Capt. 172, Curc. 23, 25, Merc. 642, 716, Men. 608, Most. 548, 750. Pl. 13, Ter. 2.

(b). A negative answer was probably expected in Asin. 830 (*numquidnam*), Men. 1146, Ps. 1330, Rud. 832, Eun. 994, Ph. 563, but so far as a negative implication exists, it is due to the challenging tone noticed above with *num*. These cases therefore form a middle step to the following class. They are Cas. III 5, 41, Poen. 1355, Ps. 728, Eun. 283, Hec. 865, Ph. 474, 509. With *numquidnam*, Bacch. 1110, Ad. 265, Andr. 325, Heaut. 429, Hec. 267.

The question *numquis hic (ad)est?* used when the speaker wants to impart a secret, deserves special mention. It is used Most. 472, Mil. 994, 1019, Rud. 948, St. 102, Eun. 549. Cf. also Trin. 69, below. This seems to mean "Is there any one here? (I hope not)" and to be in its form almost neutral. Pl. 14, Ter. 11.

(c). *numquis*, with negative effect, in questions challenging the hearer to deny an evident fact.

Pers. 462, 726, Cas. II 6, 70, *numquid moror?* Cf. *num moror?* Rud. 865, quoted above, Rud. 736, *fateor, ego trifurcifer sum: . . . numqui minus hasce esse oportet liberas?* Also with *numqui minus*, Rud. 1020, Ps. 160, Ad. 800, and *numqui nitidiusculum*, Ps. 219. Other cases of *numquid* are Mil. 1130, Ps. 919, Pers. 551, Ad. 689, Eun. 163, 475. The challenging tone is somewhat less distinct in Amph. 347, Bacch. 884, Eun. 1043. Ps. 495 resembles Ps. 368, Most. 1141. In Epid. 593 there is an affectation of humility and innocence, but the general sense is the same. Trin. 69, *numquis est hic alius praeter me atque te?* is especially instructive. It is essentially the same in form as *numquis hic (ad)est?* Mil. 994, 1019, etc., but differs from them in the circumstances. The passage is (*venio*) *malis te ut verbis multis multum obiurigem. || men? || numquis . . . ? || nemost*. The form of the question and the quiet answer *nemost* show that it is properly only an ordinary question, "is there any one else here?" but when brought into connection with *men?* "do you mean *me?*" it assumes a challenging tone and seems to demand a negative answer.

Similar in general effect to these are questions with *numquae causast quin* used in *stipulatio*. See Lor. Einl. zu Ps. Anm. 9.

Aul. 262, *sed nuptias hodie quin faciamus numquae causast ? || immo hercle optuma*. Capt. 353, Amph. 852 (*numquid causam dicis quin*), Ps. 533, Trin. 1188 *numquid causaest quin . . .* Here the question expresses in interrogative form the fact to which the previous dialogue has led up, that is, the readiness of the other person to make the bargain. As *numquid moror ?* means "Isn't it plain from my actions that I am not delaying?" so this means "There is no objection on your part, is there? to the bargain." The negative sense thus forced upon the question justifies *quin* and *immo*. Pl. 21, Ter. 5.

(d). *numquid vis ?* On this formula *abeundi* Don. remarks, Eun. II 3, 50 (341), "abituri, ne id dure facerent, *numquid vis ?* dicebant iis, quibuscum constitissent." Brix, Trin.<sup>3</sup> 192, translates, "Wünschest du sonst noch etwas?" and I should agree with him in thinking that the words in themselves contain no negative. The politeness of the question would be slight if it meant "You don't want anything more, do you?" It is like the shopman's question, as the customer takes out his money, "Can I show you anything else?" The courtesy consists in making the offer as if it were to be accepted; the negative suggestion comes from the readiness already shown by the other speaker to bring the interview to a close. There is no challenge, and the analogy to *numquis hic adest* is close.

*Numquid vis ?* is used Amph. 542, 544, Bacch. 604, Capt. 191, Curc. 516, 525, Men. 328, 548, Merc. 325, Mil. 1086, Ps. 665, Trin. 192, Truc. 883, Ad. 432, Hec. 272.

Other forms are *numquid me vis ? n. aliud me v. ?* and with *ceterum*, Aul. 175, 263, Cist. I 1, 121, Curc. 522, Epid. 512, Mil. 575, Pers. 692, 708, Eun. 191, Ph. 151, 458.

Without verb, *numquid aliud (me) ?* Bacch. 757, Capt. 448, Mil. 259, 1195, Most. 404, Poen. 801, Eun. 363.

With infin., Capt. 400 (*nuntiari*), Ps. 370 (*dicere*).

With *quin* clause, Cist. I 1, 119, Amph. 970, Ad. 247.

Other verbs are *imperas*, Eun. 213, *me rogaturu's*, Trin. 198, *me morare*, Poen. 911. *num quippiam* is used Pers. 735, Truc. 432 (Müll. 463, *numquid nunc*.) Pl. 33, Ter. 8.

When *quid* is in the acc. cognate or of "compass and extent," it has very little weight in the sentence, and *numquid* becomes nearly equivalent to *num*, serving merely as an interrogative particle. So *numquid moror ?* is about the same as *num moror ?* and see Rud. 865, Pers. 551, Most. 750, Andr. 943, Ps. 1330, Asin. 830, Rud. 832, etc.

The following passages have been passed over as conjectural or too doubtful for use:—*num*, Amph. 321, Cas. II 2, 24, II 6, 22 (conj. Uss.), IV 3, 14, 620 Gepp., 809 Gepp. (Uss. 892, *nunc*), Men. 823, Merc. 981, Poen. 258, Ps. 472, Trin. 922, Truc. 186, 546, 723, Ad. 395. *numquid*, Cas. 757 (Gepp. conj.), Most. 726, Truc. 639.

The uncertainty in regard to the etymology of *num* and the lack of sharply distinguished idioms makes the history of the uses obscure, but the challenging use, which afterward became the use "expecting a negative answer," seems to bear somewhat the same relation to *num* in neutral questions that "*ne* = *nonne*" bears to the ordinary *ne*. That is, the negative opinion of the speaker and so the expectation of a negative answer are made apparent by something in the action or, less often than with "*ne* = *nonne*," in the words. This is so similar to the special use of *ne* that it needs no further comment. Rud. 865, where *num* in the challenging sense and *ne* in the sense of *nonne* are both due to the same influence, is a good illustration.

The only question is whether *num* in this challenging use preserves anything of its original force.

It is hardly possible that *num* has here any original negative effect, since a negative force would require an affirmative answer. Nor am I able to see in these questions the slightest trace of time-force, such as Kühner and Draeger find in *num moror* and *numquid vis*. To succeed in shoving an Engl. *now* or a German *nun* into the translation without destroying the sense, does not prove the existence of any time-force in *num*. It seems probable also that the loss of the time-force was a necessary accompaniment of the development of an interrogative particle out of an adverb of time.

There is, however, another use of *nunc*, which seems to me to be connected with the challenging *num*, that is, *nunc* in the sense of "in view of this," "under these circumstances." This use appears to be closely related to *nam*, in that it reasons from what precedes, and as it shows the pronominal force of *nunc* it is probably an early sense. At any rate, it is found in Pl., and in *quid nunc ago?* has a distinct challenging force. Cf. the adversative use in Livy, pointed out by Wölfflin<sup>3</sup> on XXI 13, 2. The circumstances which give a challenging tone to questions, even when they have *ne* (Ad. 136), would tend to preserve this tone in a word which already possessed it.

While the neutral *num* is found in later Latin, e. g. Hor. Sat. II 6, 53, *numquid de Dacis audisti?* it was, perhaps even in the time of Pl., a dying usage, being pushed aside by *ne* in its ordinary sense. But so far as I can judge from the incomplete statistics at my command, the challenging *num* increased in usage, and took its regular sense of expecting a negative answer.

### III. *Ecquis, ecquid, en umquam.*

The commonly received derivation of *ecquis* is from *en-quis* with assimilation of *en*. Ribbeck, however, Lat. Partik. p. 42, points out the difficulty of supposing that *en (em)* could change to *ec*, in view of forms like *hunc, illunc*, and prefers to leave *ec-*unexplained.

Kühner, II 995, makes two curious mistakes in classing *ecquis* with *quis* interrogative, and in saying "in direkten Fragen zeigt es an dass man mit Bestimmtheit eine negative Antwort erwartet."

As with *numquis* the variations in the form of the question are not sufficient to serve as a basis for classification, and all that can be done is to show the general function and note some of the idiomatic uses.

(a). In the masc. and fem., and in the neuter as subject or object, *ecquis* is a colorless interrogative-indefinite. Some few exceptions to this will be noted below.

Amph. 856, *dic mihi verum serio, ecquis alius Sosia intust, . . . ?* Rud. 1033, *ecquem in his locis novisti?* Asin. 514, Capt. 511, Cist. IV 2, 42, Epid. 437, Men. 135, Mil. 782, Ps. 971, St. 222, 342, Truc. 508.

When, as frequently happens, *ecquis* is in agreement with some definite word or phrase, the indefinite *quis* has little more force than the indefinite article. Poen. 1044, *sed ecquem adolescentem tu hic novisti Agorastoclem?* Esp. with the plural, Ps. 484, *ecquas viginti minas paritas ut a me auferas?* the special sense of *quis* seems wholly lost. Merc. 390, Ps. 482, Rud. 125, 313, 316, Hec. 804. Also perhaps Mil. 794, Most. 770. These questions could be about as well expressed by *-ne*.

*ecquis est qui* with the subjunct. occurs Cas. V 3, 12, Curc. 301, Merc. 844, Most. 354, Rud. 949.

In three cases, Merc. 844, *ecquisnam deust, qui mea nunc laetitia fuit?* Rud. 971, Eun. 1031, there is an expectation of a negative answer, but it has nothing to do with *ecquis*, which is in its ordinary sense. These are the only cases of *ecquis* masc. or fem. except those given below, used in knocking at a door.

*ecquid* as subject of *est*, with partitive gen. Asin. 648, *ecquid est salutis?* Pers. 107, Poen. 257, Rud. 750, Truc. 897, Ph. 474. Possibly Truc. 93.

*ecquid* as direct object. Men. 149, Pers. 225, Poen. 619, Ps. 739, Rud. 1030, St. 338, Eun. 279, Heaut. 595, Ph. 798. Verb to be supplied Merc. 282. Pl. 40, Ter. 6.

(b). *ecquid* in the accus. of "compass and extent." With *meministi*, Bacch. 206, Mil. 42, Pers. 108, Poen. 985, 1062, Rud. 1310. With *amas*, Asin. 899, Cas. II 8, 19, Truc. 542, Eun. 456; *amare videor*, Poen. 327; *adsimulo*, Men. 146; *madere*, Most. 319; *placent*, Most. 906; *oneravit*, Mil. 902; *sentis*, Men. 912; *facere coniecturam*, Men. 163; *ecquid te pudet*, Cas. II 3, 26; Poen. 1305, Ps. 370, Andr. 871; *ecquid lubet*, Curc. 128; *ecquid in mentemst tibi*, Bacch. 161.

With adjectives, Mil. 1106, 1111, Ps. 746, 748, Truc. 505.

Pl. 26, Ter. 2.

In many of these cases *ecquid* has degenerated into an interrogative particle (cf. *numquid*). It has generally a neutral effect, indicating nothing as to the answer expected, but like *ne* or *num* it may be used in circumstances which admit only one answer, and so may seem to expect an affirmative or negative. *ecquid matrem amas?* (Asin. 899) is used where only the negative is possible; *ecquid amas nunc me?* (Cas. II 8, 19) hopes for an affirmative answer. *ecquid te pudet?* is not distinguishable in effect from *non te pudet?* And in general *ecquid* not only resembles *num*, *numquid*, but is also frequently used in immediate connection with them.

(c). *ecquid* with pres. indic. 2d sing. in impv. sense. Aul. 636, *ecquid agis?* || *quid agam?* Cist. III 12, Epid. 688, Amph. 577, *ecquid audis?* Aul. 270, Pers. 488, Trin. 717; Truc. 584 is uncertain, but *ecqui auditis* (Sch.) is without parallel. This use is less marked with other verbs, yet some impv. force seems to be present with all verbs in 2d pers., except where *ecquid* is defined by a partitive gen. or other phrase. Curc. 519, *ecquid das...*? Poen. 364, *ecquid ais?* Ps. 383, *ecquid inperas?* So, somewhat less clearly, in Poen. 385, Men. 149, Rud. 1030. In these questions *ecquid* has no new and special force; the impv. effect is produced, as in *abin*, *audin*, by the asking of an urgent question about an action, which would be either going on or just about to take place. It is not to be expected that there should be any sharp line dividing impv. questions from others of similar form, and Men. 149, Rud. 1030, form a kind of half-way point between *ecquid adportas boni?* and *ecquid agis?*

(d). Like these in sense are a few questions in 3d pers. with *ecquis* as subject. Asin. 910, *ecquis currit pollinctorem arcessere?* Bacch. 11, Cas. II 2, 2, Men. 1003, St. 352, Cas. II 6, 52, *praecide os tu illi hodie. age, ecquid fit?* has the same kind of sense, and Uss. rightly compares *quid fit?* Bacch. 626, 879, to show that *fit* has really the effect of a 2d pers. active. *ecquid fit?* = *ecquid agis?* very nearly. With impv. effect, Pl. 21.

(e). One of the most common uses of *ecquis* is when the speaker is impatiently knocking at the door of a house, and, while the cases are not all alike in sense, I place them by themselves because they illustrate the gradual transitions which questions with *ecquis* make from one meaning to another.

*ecquis hic est?* Amph. 1020, Bacch. 582, Capt. 830, Men. 673 (*e. h. e. ianitor?*), Mil. 1297, Most. 339, 899, Poen. 1118, Rud. 762, Eun. 530 (*est om.*). *ecquis in villast*, Rud. 413, *in aedibust*, Bacch. 581.

With other verbs the impv. effect appears, as in *d. ecquis (hoc) aperit (ostium)?* Amph. 1020, Capt. 830, Most. 900, 988, Bacch. 582, Ps. 1139, Truc. 664. Most. 445 probably belongs here. Cf. Lor.<sup>2</sup>, Krit. Anm. With *exit*, Bacch. 583, Most. 900, Truc. 255. *prodit, recludit*, Rud. 413. Pl. 23, Ter. 1.

The noticeable point is that these two kinds of questions are frequently used together, e. g. Amph. 1020 f., Most. 899 f., Rud. 413, Bacch. 581 ff. Cf. *quin* with impv. and with pres. indic. *ecquis in aedibust (villast)?* evidently can have no impv. force. But as the questions are alike in everything except the verbs, the difference in sense must be due to the fact that the active verbs *aperit, exit* answer themselves; it is plain that no one is opening, is coming out, and the underlying idea, "if no one is doing it now, he should do it at once," becomes prominent, with its semi-impv. force.

Truc. 255, Trin. 870, *heus, ecquis his foribus tutelam gerit?* show how slight a variation of sense might turn an impatient question into an impv. It seems to mean "Is any one guarding this door?" (= *ecquis hic ianitor est?* Cf. Trin. 1057 f.). If the phrase *tutelam gerere* were in any degree active ("come to the help of, save, protect"), it would be impv. And even with *est* there is sometimes a shade of impv. effect, cf. Most. 899, *heus, ecquis hic est, maxumam qui his iniuriam foribus defendat?*

(f). In a few cases, by a kind of anacoluthon, *ecquid* is preceded or followed by another interrogative word. Bacch. 980, *quid quod*

*te misi, ecquid egisti?* Ps. 740, *quid, si . . . , ecquid habet?* In Pers. 310 the MSS give *ecquid, quod mandavi tibi, estne in te speculae?* Rit. *est nunc*, with other changes *metr. grat.* There are probably other cases; my list is not, I think, complete.

In Cas. II 6, 22 (270 Gepp.), Ps. 737, Pers. 534, *ec* is supplied by conjecture. In Asin. 432 *ecquis* is a corruption of a proper name.

Upon *ecquis* in general Draeger, I, p. 344, acutely remarks, "eine specielle Bedeutung hat diese Form der Frage nicht, doch ist oft eine besondere Eringlichkeit bemerkbar." This urgency, which is the main characteristic of *ecquis*, suggests a connection with the vivid *em* or *en* rather than with the indefinite *egue*, but is of course not decisive.

It is remarkable that Ter. uses *ecquis* so seldom; he appears to have anticipated the classical usage, in which *numquis* is much more common than *ecquis*.

#### *En umquam.*

These words occur in the MSS Cist. I 1, 88, Men. 925, Rud. 987, 1117, Trin. 589, Ph. 329, 348. To these Brix adds by a very probable conjecture Men. 143. To what has been said by Ribbeck, Partik. p. 34, I have nothing to add, except that Brix seems right in saying on Men.<sup>3</sup> 143 that the words are not necessarily emotional.

#### IV.—QUESTIONS WITHOUT AN INTERROGATIVE PARTICLE.

Questions without a particle occur about nine hundred times in Plautus and Terence. Before proceeding to the consideration of these in detail, some two or three points which have a general bearing upon them must be noticed.

In the first place, as the line which divides declarative from interrogative sentences is not clearly defined nor indeed capable of clear definition, and as *ne* would be used mainly where the questioning tone was rather clearly felt by the speaker, we must expect to find among sentences without a particle many semi-interrogative sentences; about these we cannot always be certain how much questioning effect they may have had. These, with some other sentences which omit *ne* for special reasons, I shall set aside first, as contributing least to the history of the interrogative sentence.

In the second place, there are three conceivable ways in which an interrogative sentence might differ from the same sentence put

declaratively: (1) it might omit words which the declarative sentence would contain; (2) it may contain words not found in the declarative sentence; (3) it may differ in the order of the words. There is no other way in which a question may be marked in writing. Omitting the first case, which of course does not occur, we must include under the second not only the recognized interrogative particles *ne*, *num*, *an*, *ec*-, with *quis* in all forms, but also cases where a personal pronoun is expressed to help out the interrogative emphasis (if I am right in supposing that such cases may be found), as well as the cases where a word is used in meanings that have no parallel in declarative sentences, e. g., *ita*, *satis* and perhaps *iam*, *etiam*. In the third case, where the changed order is the only thing to indicate the question, we have the questions whose interrogative character may have been fully denoted in speaking by voice-inflections and tones. We may in part recover these inflections by the analogies of modern colloquial usage, but such analogies are of course to be used only with great caution. Most of the tone and inflection must escape us; only when the emphasis was strong enough to affect the order of the words has it left any mark upon the written language. And even when the order is changed under the stress of interrogative emphasis, there remains the difficulty of distinguishing this from other kinds of emphasis, which so frequently cause variation from the so-called normal order.

It is plain, therefore, that no perfectly logical classification of questions without a particle is possible. In the following arrangement I have placed first the sentences in which the interrogative tone seems slight, the sentences which lie in the borderland between questions and assertions; second, the sentences in which the interrogative tone, though generally distinct, was not sufficient to affect the order. After these I have gathered together a few sentences in which the order of the words seems to mark the question. These divisions overlap one another somewhat, but they will at least serve as indications of certain groupings and tendencies of usage, and in this way help toward an understanding of the history of the interrogative sentence.

#### A.—IDIOMS AND SENTENCES WITH SLIGHT INTERROGATIVE EFFECT.

1. *possum*. St. 324, *possum scire ex te verum?* || *potes*. Amph. 346, Cas. III 5, 26 (Becker, 178 f.), Pers. 414, 423, all with dependent infin. and with *possum* at the beginning of the sentence.

These questions are strongly ironical, but they are in form questions for information. The irony consists in using a formal interrogation instead of a less courteous command. We should therefore expect *ne*. Its absence is due to the compound nature of *possum*; to say *pos-sum-ne* would have been against the usage, which required, e. g., *molestusne sum*, not *molestus sumne*, and so *potis-ne sum*, not *potis sum-ne*. Plautus therefore does not use *possumne* at all; Terence does not feel the compound nature of *possum* so plainly, and uses it once in a sense exactly the same, Eun. 712, *possumne ego hodie ex te exculpere verum?*

Pl. 5, Ter. 0.

*potin* in 2d and 3d pers. is perhaps preserved longer by its idiomatic use with *ut*. *potestne* does not occur in Pl. or Ter.

2. *cesso*. Aul. 397, *sed cesso priusquam prorsus perii currere?* Capt. 827, *sed ego cesso hunc Hegionem onerare laetitia senem?* Aul. 627, Cas. II 3, 20, III 6, 4, Epid. 342, Merc. 129, Mil. 896, Pers. 197, Rud. 676, Truc. 630, Ad. 320, 586, 712, Andr. 845, Eun. 265, 996, Heaut. 410, 757, Hec. 324, Ph. 285, 844.

Pl. II, Ter. II.

These are all in soliloquy and all have an infin. without subject accus. The verb stands first or preceded only by *sed*, *at* and a word or two, *ego*, *etiam*, except in Epid. 342, when the infin. comes first.

These sentences are generally punctuated with a question mark, but single passages are marked with a period by Bent., Umpf., Wagn., Speng., Uss. Taking them all together it is plain that they are not questions for information; in many cases, e. g. Capt. 827, Ph. 844, they have not even the hesitating tone of *videon* in soliloquy nor the challenging demand of *sumne*. I believe that the position of *cesso* at the beginning of the sentence (*cesso ego* three times in Pl.) is due to non-interrogative emphasis, so that the sentence means something like "This is regular shuffling—foolish hesitation," or *Hibernice* "Sure it's delaying I am." That this emphatic recognition of the meaning of the speaker's action approached an exclamation is plain from Epid. 342, *sed ego hinc migrare cesso, . . . ?* and the use in connection with other exclamatory questions (Merc. 129, *at etiam asto? at etiam cesso . . . ?*) shows a leaning toward the interrogation. But on the whole the emphasis which caused *cesso* to stand at the head of the sentence was not the questioning emphasis, and the *cesso* phrases lie nearer the declarative than the interrogative sentence. There is no connection with the use of the pres. indic. in fut. sense.

Compare also the Terentian use of *cessas*, given below under D, which in some respects resembles *cesso*.

3. *nempe*. To the full discussion of the uses of *nempe* by Langen, Beiträge, pp. 125-132, I have nothing to add. Though perhaps properly printed with a question mark, these sentences are not really interrogative. They add an interpretation, more or less hesitating and conjectural, of what has been said by the other speaker. Langen calls such a sentence "eine als sicher richtig bezeichnete Voraussetzung, resp. Behauptung." As with the Engl. "doubtless," the tone and inflection might so far overcome the proper sense of *nempe* as to give the sentence a half-interrogative effect.

The list below may not include all cases which in any edition are marked with an interrogation point.

Aul. 293, Asin. 117, 339, Bacch. 188 [so Goetz, but cf. Lang. p. 131], 689, Cist. II 3, 56, Curc. 44, Epid. 449 (Goetz *quemne*), Men. 1030, Mil. 337, 808, 906, 922, Most. 491, 653, 919, Ps. 353, 1169, 1189, Rud. 268, 343, 565, 567, 1057, 1080, 1392, Trin. 196, 328, 966, 1076, Truc. 362, And. 30, 195, 950, Eun. 563, Hec. 105, Ph. 307.

Pl. 31, Ter. 6.

4. *fortasse* (*fortassis*), *scilicet*, *videlicet*. Sentences with these words are sometimes printed as questions. They are similar to *nempe* questions, except that, from its proper meaning, *fortasse* is more hesitating. I have noted the following cases: *fortasse*, *fortassis*, Amph. 726, *tu me hic vidisti?* || *ego, inquam, . . . || in somnis fortassis?* (cf. Most. 491, *nempe ergo in somnis?*), Bacch. 671, Curc. 324, Pers. 21, 441, Rud. 140, And. 119, Heaut. 824, Ph. 145, 901.

*scilicet*, Eun. 346, Heaut. 705, Ph. 695.

*videlicet*, Capt. 286.

Pl. 7, Ter. 7.

In a few cases sentences similar to these, containing a parenthetical *credo*, are punctuated as questions, but I have made no record of them.

In all these cases, with *cesso*, *nempe*, *fortasse*, *scilicet*, *videlicet*, we have sentences which lie between an assertion and a question, and which could have either effect according to the inflection of the voice.

#### B.—REPETITIONS.

When a speaker takes up and repeats words just used by the other person in the dialogue, it is because these words in particular have excited some emotion, surprise or incredulity or indignation.

The effect is not necessarily interrogative, but rather exclamatory, shading off into interrogative.

1. The words are repeated without change, and the verb is not expressed.

Amph. 692, . . . *ut dudum dixerat*. || *dudum? quam dudum istuc factumst?* Amph. 901, Capt. 838, 844, Men. 380, 615, Merc. 735, Mil. 376 (Bx. uses period), Most. 383, 477L<sup>2</sup>, 493, 638, 642, 810, Poen. 474, Ps. 79, 305 (but cf. Lang. Beitr. 315), 345, 637, 717, 842, Rud. 799, St. 749, Trin. 941 twice. In Curc. 636 the repetition is due to doubtful conjecture. In Trin. 375, . . . *ducere uxorem sine dote*. || *sine dote uxorem?* || *ita*, Ritschl's *uxoremne* has been accepted by Brix, who quotes instances of *ne* with second or third word in the sentence. His list might be somewhat enlarged, but the only cases where the MSS give *ne* with a noun in repetitions are Epid. 30, *armane*, and Eun. 573, 992, *pro eunuchon*. The latter is the nearest approach to a parallel to *uxoremne*, and does not give it much support. The passages from Ter. are Ad. 700, 753, And. 328, 663, 945 (Dz. only), Eun. 184, 318, 370, 856, 859, 908, 1073, Heaut. 192, 331, 587, 815, 861, 938, Hec. 432, 639, Ph. 300, 385, 553, 558, 642, 790, 981.

Cases where *non* is repeated are given below.

Pl. 25 [27,] Ter. 27.

2. Slight changes are made in the repeated words, especially in the person of pronouns. Curc. 582, *tuom libertum*. || *meum?* Cas. II 6, 14, III 6, 12, Men. 282, Poen. 762, 1238, Ps. 715, 723, Truc. 918, Ad. 697, 934, Eun. 745, 798, Hec. 209, Ph. 447.

In the following the changes are greater. Capt. 148, *alienus* . . . || *alienus ego? alienus ille?* Aul. 784, *renuntiare repudium iussit* . . . || *repudium rebus paratis exornatis nuptiis?* Eun. 224, 626, And. 928, Ad. 182, 960. Ph. 1047 is an improbable conjecture. In Rud. 728 Sch. reads *det*. In Aul. 326 the only objection to Wagner's text, *fur? etiam fur trisurcifer*, is that it makes the thought unnecessarily involved. Cas. II 5, 10, *cum uxore mea?* is changed by Gepp. to *uxoren*, cf. Trin. 375. In Andr. 469, Merc. 525, there is, strictly speaking, no repetition of words but only of the thought. Curc. 323 *ain tu? omnia haec?* is similar.<sup>1</sup>

Pl. 14 [16], Ter. 12.

<sup>1</sup> Repetitions preceded by *quid?* are not included in these lists. They are in many cases best punctuated with a comma after *quid* and cannot be clearly distinguished from repetitions like Capt. 1006, . . . *gnate mi*. || *hem, quid gnate mi?* ("What do you mean by *gnate mi?*"), or even like Ps. 46, *salutem* . . . ||

3. The verb, if it is in the 3d pers., may be repeated without change, either with or without other words. Curc. 173, *te prohibet erus . . .* || *prohibet? nec prohibere quit nec prohibebit.* Aul. 720, Cas. III 5, 38, Epid. 699, Merc. 181, 534, Most. 376, 481, 554, 830, 946, 1079, Poen. 1309, Rud. 1095 (infin.), Trin. 969, Truc. 306, Ad. 934, And. 876, Eun. 956, 984, 986, Heaut. 606, Hec. 100 (infin.), Ph. 510 (twice). Pl. 16, Ter. 9.

4. The verb may be changed in person and other changes or additions may be made. Aul. 761, *quod subrupuisti meum?* || *subrupui ego tuum?* Aul. 652, Bacch. 681, 825, Capt. 611, Cas. III 5, 10, Curc. 705, Epid. 712, Men. 394, Mil. 556, 1367, Most. 1029, Ps. 509, 711, 1203, Truc. 292, Ad. 565, And. 617, Eun. 162, Heaut. 720, 1009, 1013, Hec. 206 and perhaps Hec. 72, Ph. 389, Ad. 940, 950. Cf. also Trin. 127, above. In Aul. 720 *nescis?* is used as if some spectator had said *nescio* in answer to the previous question *dic igitur, quis habet.* In Men. 645, *palla mihist domo subrupta.* || *palla subruptast mihi?* the person of the pronoun is intentionally unchanged; in Most. 375, . . . *ego disperii.* || *bis peristi? qui potest?* the speaker is drunk.

Cases where the change is still greater cannot be classified minutely, and the question whether the speaker is introducing a new idea or catching up one which has been implied in the previous conversation can be settled only by a careful reading of the context. Such cases are Ps. 344, Trin. 605, Ad. 726. Sometimes the repetition is in the thought, not in any one word, and amounts to an interpretation of what has been said with the intention of bringing out more clearly some one aspect of it. So Ad. 747, *domi erit.* || *pro divom fidem, meretrix et mater familias una in domo?* Capt. 262, *ut vos hic, itidem illic apud vos meus servatur filius.* || *captus est?* (= "you mean that he is a prisoner?" not "is he a prisoner?") Ad. 538, *lupus in fabula.* || *pater est?* (Cf. Dz. note. Nearly equal to "what! my father?") So Men. 1058. When the idea has only been implied in a general way, the whole passage must be read. So Bacch. 145, Cist. II 1,

*quam salutem?* That is, they run over into *quis* in repetitions and ordinary *quis*-questions. They are Amph. 410, Ba. 114, 569, 852, Merc. 542, 685, Mil. 27, 316, 323, 470, Pers. 741, Rud. 736, 881, St. 597, Andr. 765, Eun. 638, Heaut. 311.

There is something of the same difficulty when the verb is repeated; so *erras.* || *quid erro?* (Men. 1025) is very near to *amat . . .* || *quid? amat?* (Eun. 986), and without the help of the voice inflection it is impossible to draw perfectly sharp lines; cf. Mil. 819 with Ps. 711.

24, Mil. 976, Rud. 752 (III 4, 47), in Par.; Sch. gives period. St. 599, Eun. 636; also, I think, Ph. 548, Ad. 433, though the previous implication is less distinct.

Here belong also a few cases of exclamation, consisting of two or three words in which an idea already suggested is summed up. Asin. 487, *nunc demum?* Andr. 474, *hui, tam cito?* Also And. 755, Eun. 87, and Hec. 875, which would have had a verb if it had not been interrupted.

In a few passages a long sentence is taken up in parts and repeated interrogatively in order to get confirmation of each particular. The passages, which are too long to quote, are Capt. 879 ff., Ps. 1152 ff., Rud. 1267 f., Eun. 707 f., Heaut. 431 f.

Repetitions with variation of phrase, Pl. 31 [32], Ter. 23.

In all these cases there is a common element of repetition, generally exclamatory, frequently though not necessarily rejecting the repeated idea. When the repetition is plain, and no change is made except in person of verbs or pronouns, there is really nothing interrogative in the effect of the sentence, though it seems possible that an interrogative effect might be produced as in English by the voice-inflection. The common forms of reply, *ita dico, id volui dicere*, or a repetition of the word (Capt. 838, *cedo manum. || manum?* || *manum, inquam*), show that there is no request for information in this form of question. But the moment the speaker adds to the repeated words some idea of his own, or repeats not the precise words but some modification of them, he introduces an element which in the full logical presentation of his thought would require a separate question. Thus Ad. 726, *scio. || scis et patere?* means in full "You know it! And do you endure it, too?" Aul. 784, *renuntiare repudium iussit . . . || repudium rebus paratis exornatis nuptiis?* "Break the engagement! Does he propose that when everything is ready for the wedding?" In such cases the exclamatory structure of the first words is carried over into the second part and the real question is merged in the exclamation. Very possibly there would be in the Latin, as in the English, a slight pause after *repudium*.

Further, when the idea only is repeated in words which amplify or interpret it, the line which separates such exclamations from real questions is easily passed. Thus in Ad. 950, *agellist hic sub urbe paulum . . . || paulum id autemst?* does not mean "is that a little matter?" but "is that *what you call* a little matter?" In Capt. 262, given above, the change from *captus est?* "you mean that

he's a prisoner?" to *captusne est?* "Is he a prisoner?" is so slight that either might be used in such a conversation. In repetitions which are considerably changed, therefore, we cannot use the principle here outlined as a basis for deciding text questions. Especially in the long series of repetitions it is impossible to be sure that *ne* would not be used. Cf. Capt. 879, *meum gnatum?* MSS *meumne*, and so Bent., Fleck., Goetz. And generally in the long-continued repetition the speaker swings away from the exclamatory form, his emotion cooling, and tends to question facts instead of statements of facts.

While the preceding classification is one of function rather than of structure, it nevertheless corresponds pretty closely to a distinction in form. In nearly all the complete sentences, the verb is near the end, or at least not near the beginning; that is, the order is declarative, not interrogative. The exceptions are Aul. 652, 761, Trin. 127, Truc. 747. In Aul. 652, *certo habes*. || *habeo ego? quid habeo?* ("Have! have what?") the verb is first for emphasis, and so, I think, in Aul. 761, *quod subrupuisti meum*. || *subrupui ego tuom? unde? aut quid id est?* Of Trin. 127 I have spoken above, and in this passage, and in Truc. 747, *non licet* with infin., the repetition is so precise and immediate that the phrases cannot be interrogative. But even granting these exceptions, it is plain that the late position of the verb in the sentence and the exclamatory nature of the repetition belong together.

The use of *autem* with repetitions I have not thought it necessary to notice, after the remarks of Langen, Beitr. 315 f. Cases in which *ain?* precedes the repetition will be found also under that word, which is more frequent in Pl. than *autem*.

5. The repeated verb is in the subjunctive.

(a). Repetitions of an imperative. Aul. 829, *i, redde aurum*. || *reddam ego aurum?* Mil. 496, *ausculla, quaeso*. || *ego auscultem tibi?* Cist. 241 U, Merc. 749 twice, Most. 579, 620 L<sup>2</sup>, Ps. 1315, And. 323 (only Umpf.; better with period), 894. Twice the reply is by a third speaker, and the verb is in the 3d pers., Ph. 1001, *tu narra*. || *scelus, tibi narret?* and Eun. 797. Besides these, Asin. 93 is a dittograph of 94; St. 471 implies the omission of a vs. containing an impv. or its equivalent; Pers. 188 is confused and probably not a repetition. Langen, Beitr. 123, objects to Wagner's punctuation and explanation of Aul. 82, and proposes, apparently with hesitation, *quippini ego intus servem?* I should follow Wagner's text, . . . *intus serva*. || *quippini? ego intus*

*servem?* understanding *quippini* to be the servant's assent to her master's order, while the next line is spoken in a grumbling undertone. Men. 198, *saltā sic cum palla . . . || ego saltabo? sanus hercle non es*, and Merc. 915 are remarkable as the only cases in which the future repeats an impv. It must be connected with the impv. use of the fut. indic. 2d pers. and with the original fut. sense of the subjunctive. Pl. 9, Ter. 4.

(b). The impv. is only implied, or is expressed in the form of a question.

Bacch. 627 *non taces, . . . ? || taceam?* With *iubesne?* Eun. 389; with *non vides?* Eun. 676; with *quid dubitas dare?* Ps. 626. Also Ad. 938, Andr. 231, Ph. 988.

(c). Repetitions of a subjunctive, either impv. or in a subordinate clause. In the former case the subjunctive is like the preceding; in the latter it is merely a quotation with change of person, as with indicatives. Ps. 1226, *saltem Pseudolum mihi dedas. || Pseudolum ego dedam tibi?* Ps. 486, . . . *paritas, ut a me auferas. || abs te auferam?* With other tenses, Ps. 288, *surruperes patri. || surruperet hic patri, . . . ?* Bacch. 1176, Cas. II 6, 14, II 8, 18, 21, Men. 1024, Merc. 567, 575, Most. 183, Rud. 842, Ad. 396, And. 282, 382, 649, 900, Hec. 589, 670, Ph. 120, 382, 775. Also Most. 895, though it is partly corrupt.

There remain several passages in which the idea which is repeated and rejected by the subjunctive, is not distinctly expressed. Capt. 208, *at fugam fingitis . . . || nos fugiamus? quo fugiamus?* Asin. 838, *an tu me tristem putas? || putem ego quem videam esse maestum . . . ?* Asin. 482 is an interpolation; Rud. 728, *habeat, si argentum dabit. || det tibi argentum?* is an early correction now supported by A, Ps. 318, Truc. 625. Amph. 813, *mi vir, . . . || vir ego tuos sim?* (DEJ *sum*); Hec. 524, *mihine, mi vir? || vir ego tuos sim?* (*sum* all MSS exc. A), Andr. 915, *bonus est hic vir. || hic vir sit bonus?* ("Das soll ein Ehrenmann sein?" Speng.). Cas. I 1, 26, *mea praeda est illa . . . || tua praeda illaec sit?* (est BJE). The passages support each other, in spite of the variation in the MSS. It is plain, also, that *vir ego tuos sum?* would mean, "I am not your husband," while *sim* means "I am not going to be your husband any longer"; i. e., *sum* would deny the fact, *sim* rejects the claim. Pl. 22, Ter 17.

#### C.—*Rogas, negas, rogilas* AND SIMILAR VERBS.

Somewhat closely connected with repeated sentences is a group of verbs in the 2d pers. of the pres. indic., which *sum* up in a word

or two the idea of the previous sentence. For example, in Aul. 764, *nequē . . . dixi neque feci*, the second speaker instead of repeating the words in an exclamatory tone, *non dixisti?* sums up the sentence in the single word *negas?* This usage, though distinct enough with a few verbs, shades off, as repetitions do, by the addition of ideas not contained in the previous sentence, into ordinary questions or exclamations.

1. *rogas* alone. Aul. 634, *quid tibi vis reddam?* || *rogas?* Epid. 64, *amatne istam . . .?* || *rogas?* *deperit.* Bacch. 206, 216, 980, Capt. 660, Cas. II 3. 35, Epid. 276, Pers. 42 (Ba. Rit. *rogan*), 107, Poen. 263, 386, 733, Ps. 740, Rud. 860, St. 335, Trin. 80, Truc. 505, Ad. 772, And. 163, 184, 267, 909, Eun. 324, 436, 574, Heaut. 532, Ph. 574, 704, 915. Pl. 18, Ter. 12.

2. *rogitas* alone. Aul. 339, *qui vero?* || *rogitas?* Rud. 1361, Ad. 558, Eun. 366, 675, 794, 897, 948, 1008, Heaut. 631, Ph. 156, 257. With *at*, Andr. 828, Hec. 526. Pl. 2, Ter. 12.

The question which precedes *rogas?* *rogitas?* has *ne* once, *non* once, *etiam* once, *ecquid* four times; the other 37 cases, including all from Ter., have some kind of *quis* question. It is hardly likely that this is accidental, but I can see no reason for it, unless it be that a mere exclamatory repetition of e. g. *quid ego deliqui?* in the form *quid tu deliquisti?* would not be sufficiently differentiated from the ordinary question *quid tu deliquisti?* This might lead to the addition of *rogas* (see below) or to its substitution for the repetition.

With some four or five exceptions the speaker makes no pause for an answer after *rogas*, *rogitas*, but continues with some reply to the previous question. No answer is needed, in fact; the apparent question is purely exclamatory, performing the same function as exact repetitions, and differing little from the Engl. "What a question!"

3. *negas?* Curc. 711, *non commemini dicere.* || *quid?* *negas?* || *nego hercle vero.* Aul. 764, Men. 306, Mil. 829, Ph. 740.

Pl. 4, Ter. 1.

Though a pause is regularly made after *negas* and it is answered in three cases by *nego hercle vero*, it is entirely similar to *rogas*, *rogitas*.

4. *rogas*, *rogitas*, *negas* followed by other words.

*rogitas etiam?* Cas. V 4, 18.

*rogas me?* Men. 713, Amph. 571 (MSS *rogasne*. See O. Seyffert, Philol. 29 (1870), 385-6), Ad. 82, 665, Eun. 653; *rogitas*,

*quod vides?* Ps. 1163; *rogitas quid sit?* Heaut. 251; *negas, quod oculis video?* Rud. 1067. *negas novisse me?* (After *novi cum Calcha simul*) Men. 750. Pl. 6, Ter. 4.

5. *rogas, rogitas, negas* preceded by other words.

*etiam rogas?* Bacch. 331, Merc. 202, Andr. 762; *etiam rogitas?* Aul. 424, 437, 633; *me rogas?* Men. 640, Heaut. 780, Mil. 426; *quid negoti sit, rogas?* (cf. Becker, 198), Aul. 296, Mil. 317; *quid fiat, facias, agam, metuam*, etc. Ad. 288, Eun. 837, Heaut. 454, 780, Merc. 633 (V. Beck., 209, MSS *men rogas*), Amph. 1025, 1028, Aul. 551, Bacch. 65, 1196, Curc. 726, Merc. 721, Most. 907 (*ecquid*), Rud. 379, St. 333, Eun. 720, *de istac rogas virgine?*

*tu negas?* And. 909. Men. 630 (MSS *tun*) and 821 (MSS *tu*) have been given above under *tun*. Bx. reads *tu* in both, Rit. *tun*, but it is entirely likely that Pl. should use *tu* and *tun negas* without discrimination. On Capt. 571 see Bx. Anh., Langen, p. 220. *tu negas med esse* (sc. *Sosiam*)? Amph. 434, Fleck. *tun. etiam negas?* Merc. 763. Pl. 23 [24], Ter. 8.

In all cases where *rogas, rogitas* has a dependent clause, the clause is repeated from the preceding question, e.g. *quid negoti sit?* || *quid negoti sit, rogas?* In such cases both the repetition and the verb *rogas* are exclamatory, and the implication is intended that no such question should have been asked. But in the few cases where new ideas are introduced the exclamatory rejection is less prominent and the questioning effect appears. The most distinct case is Eun. 720, *quid faciundum censes?* || *de istac rogas virgine?* || *ita*, where there is no rejection. Other cases of *negas* with infin. have a faint interrogative tone.

6. With a few other verbs in the 2d pers. pres. indic. These are not clearly marked off from other verbs (esp. *verba dicendi*) in the 2d pers., but a few cases will suffice to show that this exclamatory use is not confined to *rogas, rogitas, negas*, but extends also to other words. Only the cases in which the verb stands alone, or nearly alone, are given here, because with a dependent infin. or clause the distinction is less clear.

Hec. 527, *peperit filia? hem, taces? ex quo?* Bacch. 777, *quid fit? quam mox navigo . . . ? taces?* Eun. 695, 821. In Merc. 164 *taces* is a conjecture of Ritschl, differing from all other cases in not coming immediately after a question: the passage is, besides, an interpolation. *derides?* Merc. 907, Ad. 852. Ps. 1315 is improbable. *inrides?* And. 204. *narras*, Heaut. 520 *nihil nimis.* || '*nihil*' *narras?* And. 367, *non opinor*, Dave. || '*opinor*' *narras?*

*non recte accipis; certa res est.* Also Ph. 401. To these Ad. 398, *vigilantiam tuam tu mihi narras?* bears the same relation that repetitions of an implied idea bear to exact repetitions. With these I should place Andr. 754, *male dicis?* Hec. 706, *fugis?* Heaut. 883, *chem, Menedeme, advenis?* (cf. *tu hic eras?*). Men. 166, *agedum, odorare . . . quid olet? apstines?* In Ph. 515 A has *optundis*, the other MSS *obtunde*; most editors follow Fleck. and read *optundes*. Phaedria has been pouring out petitions to Dorio, who does not trust his promises and expresses his deafness to prayers for mercy in this word, *optundis*, "You keep at it?" "You hammer away at my ears?" The future is entirely out of place, while the present is entirely in accord with the manner of Ter., who uses this kind of exclamation, especially with single words, very frequently. For parallel in sense, cf. Ad. 769, *tu verba fundis hic sapientia?* and Andr. 348, *optundis, tam etsi intellego?* Ps. 943 R. *meram iam mendacia fundes*, is properly future.

Here also belongs *cessas*, with or without infin. Cf. *cesso*, above. *cessas?* Hec. 360, Ph. 565; *sed (tu) cessas?* Hec. 814, Ph. 858; with infin., Andr. 343, Ad. 916. Not in Pl. Pl. 3 [4], Ter. 19.

To these might be added a considerable number of cases showing a less distinct relationship to *rogas*, and gradually shading off till the reference to the preceding speech or act would be imperceptible and the sentence would become distinctly interrogative. These cases will be given under other headings.

As the repetitions were marked, though not quite invariably, by having the verb near the end of the sentence, so in this class the distinction of function is marked by a special form, the use of the 2d pers. pres. indic. without dependent words, except *me*, *etiam* and a clause or infin. repeated from the preceding speech. The typical form is *rogas* and the departures from it are few and unimportant.

#### D.—QUESTIONS WITH *non* AND OTHER NEGATIVE WORDS.

Questions without a particle containing a negative word occur about two hundred times in Pl. and Ter. Of these about 180 have *non*. The problem in regard to these sentences is to see whether they have any special interrogative form, and to determine their relation to *nonne*.

1. *non* in repetitions. These may or may not have a verb. Cist. II 1, 35, *non edepol . . . recipis.* || *non? hem, quid agis?* Ad. 661, 803. Andr. 194, Heaut. 780. Asin. 445 is entirely uncertain. *quid? non?* Andr. 587, Heaut. 894.

Epid. 482, *haec non est ea. || quid? non est? || non est.* Most. 594, *non dat, non debet. || non debet?* Asin. 480, Men. 302, 503, Merc. 918, Poen. 173, 404, Ps. 326, Rud. 341, 1372, Ad. 112, Eun. 179, 679, Heaut. 612, Hec. 342. Pl. 12, Ter. 11.

Other cases occur in which the repeated idea is so expanded as to make it in part a new sentence, e.g. Most. 950, *nemo hic habitat. || non hic Philolaches adulescens habitat hisce in aedibus?* Cf. cases above, IV B. But the line which separates these from other *non*-questions is very indistinct, and I have preferred to place them below with other sentences of like form.

2. The remaining questions with *non*, except those having impv. effect, are arranged in three classes according to the position of *non* and the verb: (a) *non* and the verb together at the beginning of the sentence; (b) *non* and the verb together at the end; (c) *non* at the beginning, the verb at the end. These three arrangements do not, of course, cover all possible forms of sentence; *non* and the verb may be together in the middle of the sentence; they may be separated by a word or two, but generally the main part of the sentence, especially if there be a dependent infin., is not divided, but lies all together either after or before or between *non* and the verb.

(a). *non* and the verb are at the beginning of the sentence. Here are included some cases where *quaeso, eho, quid* or a vocative precedes, some in which *ego* or *tu* comes between *non* and the verb, and the short sentences consisting of *non* and the verb only.

*non vides* with infin. or clause. Asin. 472, *inpure, nihili, non video irasci?* Most. 811, *non vides tu hunc vultu uti tristist senex?* || *video.* Asin. 326, Bacch. 1136, Men. 947, Pers. 642, Ps. 1297, Rud. 942, Heaut. 1013. Without clause, Eun. 675, *ubi est?* || *rogitas? non vides?*

*non tu scis* with infin. or clause. Merc. 731, *non tu scis quae sit illaec?* || *immo iam scio.* Men. 714, 911, Mil. 1150, St. 606. Without clause, Asin. 215, *non tu scis? hic noster quaestus ancupi simillumust.* So Asin. 177, Amph. 703. The second sentence is here added paratactically, instead of being subordinated.

Other verbs in 2d pers. pres. indic. *non audes* with infin., Asin. 476, Ps. 1316 (A *nonne*), Truc. 425; *non audis*, with clause Ps. 230, alone like *non tu scis*, Poen. 1011; *non soles respicere te*, Ps. 612; *non intellegis?* Amph. 625; *non quis . . . durare*, Truc. 326; *non amas me?* Cas. V 4, 9; *non habes venalem amicam . . .* Ps. 341 (cf. 325); *non ornatis . . .?* Cas. III 2, 16; *non arbit-*

*raris* . . . ? Trin. 789 (MSS *nonne*); *non clamas* ? *non insanis* ? Ad. 727; *non cogitas* . . . ? Heaut. 239; *quid* ? *non obsecro es, quem* . . . ? Ph. 742.

Perf. indic. 2d pers. *non nosti nomen meum* ? Men. 294, Truc. 595; *non (con)meministi*, Men. 533, 1074, Epid. 639; *non audivisti* . . . ? Rud. 355; *non tu dixti* . . . ? And. 852 (MSS *dixtin*).

Impf. indic. Epid. 599. Fut., in short sentences, Cist. II 1, 31, 32, Merc. 750, Eun. 696.

Impersonals. *non licet* with infin. Mil. 1404, *non licet mihi dicere* ? Asin. 935, Ps. 252, Rud. 426, Truc. 747. *non (te) pudet*, Men. 708, Poen. 1301, Ph. 525. Without infin. or gen. the order indicates nothing; *non te pudet* ? Men. 741, and *non pudet te* ? Trin. 1017 are indistinguishable.

Other tenses and persons are less frequent. First pers. pres. Cas. III 6, 12. In Amph. 403 ff., where the MSS. give *nonne* in several cases, the close connection of the questions with each other obscures the effect of the order. There are three cases with 1st pers. I can see nothing to distinguish Amph. 539, *non (MSS nonne) ego possum, furcifer, te perdere* ? from Rud. 1125, *non ego te conprimere possum sine malo* ? though the order is different. Ph. 543, *non triumpho, si* . . . ? has clear *nonne* force, and, less clearly, Ph. 489, Trin. 1153.

Third pers. pres. indic. Hec. 360, *non sciunt ipsi viam* . . . ? St. 393, Eun. 839. Impf., Aul. 294, *quid* ? *hic non poterat* . . . ? Bacch. 563. Plupf., Ph. 804.

Pres. subjunct., Hec. 341, *quid faciam misera* ? *non visam uxorem Pannphili*, . . . ? Eun. 46, Ph. 419, Heaut. 583. Rud. 969 is conditional. Pl. 57, Ter. 18.

Many of the sentences just given might have been placed in the preceding class as repetitions of a previously implied negative. Thus *non nosti* follows *quisquis es* or some other expression of uncertainty; *non amas me* ? Cas. V 4, 9 is distinctly implied before; Ps. 341 has been asserted in 325; and so Ph. 742, Rud. 335, all cases of *(con)meministi* and of the pres. subj. 1st pers.

Further *non vides, non tu scis, non licet, non pudet* closely resemble *rogas* ? etc., in that they sum up in a single word the effect of the previous sentence. Cf. Eun. 675, *ubi est* ? || *rogilas* ? *non vides* ?

(b). *non* and the verb together, but not at the beginning of the sentence; in most cases at or near the end.

None in indic. with 1st pers.

Second pers. Epid. 514, *fides non reddis?* Eun. 463, *quid? hunc non vides?* Amph. 659, 937, Cist. III 11, Trin. 810. Perfect, Men. 505, *tuom parasitum non novisti?* Aul. 772. Fut., Mil. 696. Plupf., Ph. 384.

Third pers. Hec. 231, *cum puella anum suscepisse inimicitias non pudet?* Cas. IV 4, 25 (A, Gepp. *nonne*). In Asin. 395 the Goetz-Loewe text, *sed post non rediit huc?* seems to me improbable on account of *sed*, which is not found elsewhere in *non*-questions.

With subjunct., Eun. 798, *ego non tangam meam?* Impf., Eun. 591. In Rud. 723 the subjunc. is independent of the question.

Pl. 10 [11], Ter. 5.

These few cases are not different in sense from the preceding. *non pudet* at the end has the same relation to *non pudet* at the beginning that *quid sit me rogitas?* bears to *rogitas quid siet?*

(c). *non* and the verb are separated, *non* being at the beginning, the verb generally at the end.

In the first pers., Amph. 518, *carnufex, non ego te novi?* the same, Capt. 564, Men. 408. *non . . . sum*, Heaut. 920; *non . . . possum*, Rud. 1125. Amph. 406 has *nonne* in MSS. Perf. indic., Men. 512, *non ego te indutum foras exire vidi pallam?* Men. 631.

Second pers. pres. Pers. 385, *non tu nunc hominum mores vides, . . .?* Capt. 969, Cas. V 4, 28, Epid. 480, Men. 307, Merc. 133, 881, 913, 1014, Pers. 670, Rud. 347, 740, 870, And. 710, Ph. 492. Perf. indic., Epid. 638, *quis tu's homo, . . .?* || *non me novisti?* Mil. 428, Men. 438, Poen. 557, Rud. 1372, Heaut. 436. Impf. indic., Ad. 560, *non tu eum rus hinc modo produxe aibas?* || *factum*. Capt. 662, Pers. 415, Ps. 500. Fut. indic., And. 921, *non tu tuom malum aequo animo feres?* Eun. 819, Hec. 603, Ph. 1002.

Third pers. Bacch. 1193, *non tibi in mentemst, . . .?* Bacch. 1000, Cas. III 2, 17, Most. 950, Ad. 94, 754, Hec. 236, Ph. 392. Amph. 406 is in a series of *non*-questions, and in 404, 405, 407, 452 the MSS have *nonne*.

Pres. subjunct. 1st pers. Epid. 588, *non patrem ego te nominem . . .?* Truc. 732, Eun. 223. Impf. subjunc., Trin. 133, Curc. 552, (B *nonne*). Third pers., Ph. 119 in apodosis.

In a few cases, Asin. 652, And. 149, 752, Ad. 709, the verb is omitted.

Pl. 42, Ter. 18.

The following are corrupt or conjectural: Cas. III 5, 53, Men. 453, 823, Mil. 301, Most. 555, Poen. 258, Truc. 257, 259.

As has been said, this division is not entirely precise, either for

interrogative or for declarative sentences. Single words, mostly conjunctions or interjections, occasionally precede *non*, a pronoun or adverb (*nunc*) sometimes separates *non* and the verb, and in the third class, under (c), the verb is frequently followed by two or three words, instead of being at the end. Also, in using the order as a basis for comparison, sentences consisting of *non* and the verb only must of course be thrown out, as well as other short sentences like *non te pudet?* *non me novisti?* and perhaps *fides non reddis?* Cf. *non manum abstines?* Even *non nosti nomen meum?* cannot differ greatly from *tuom parasitum non novisti?* But longer sentences fall pretty plainly into these three classes.

There are no statistics in regard to the position of *non* in declarative sentences, but taking a single play, and counting only simple sentences like those used in questions, there are in Trin. 33 cases, divided as follows:

	Declar.	Interrog.
(a) <i>non</i> and verb early, . .	6 = 18 per cent.	75 = 50 per cent.
(b) <i>non</i> and verb late, . .	11 = 33 per cent.	15 = 10 per cent.
(c) <i>non</i> and verb separated, . .	16 = 49 per cent.	60 = 40 per cent.

Taking the first two classes, it appears that *non* and the verb are put in the first place much more frequently in interrogative than in declarative sentences. This is due mainly to the large number of questions which resemble *rogas?* viz., *non vides*, *non tu scis*, *non nosti*, *non licet*, *non pudet*; the rest are either repetitions or sentences which would have *non* and the verb early for emphasis (Bx. on Trin. 414), even if they were declarative. A consideration of the order therefore strengthens the conclusion indicated by the meaning, that these are not properly questions, but exclamations, which presuppose a negative opinion on the part of the other speaker, and express doubt or rejection by repeating the negation in an exclamatory tone. In the cases under (a) only the verb and *non* belong to the repetition, and these therefore stand first as the starting-point of the speaker's thought. Cf. Aul. 784, . . . *renuntiare repudium iussit* . . . || *repudium rebus paratis exornatis nuptiis?* Where the verb and *non* stand at the end, the exclamatory tone is sustained through the whole sentence.

In the third class, (c), *non* comes at the beginning of a declarative sentence almost invariably in order that it may go with some single word. So in the Trin. with *ita* 649, *fugitivos* 1027, *credibile* 606, *optuma* 392, *satis* 249, 623, *minus* 409, *edepol* 357, *temere*

740. In 705 only *enim* separates *non* from the verb; in 341, 414, 976 *non* contrasts one clause with another. The only cases in which it can go with the whole sentence are 480, 720 and perhaps 211. But when such sentences as these become interrogative they drop *non*, that is, they pass to the interrogation from the affirmation, not from the negation (cf. Paul, Princip.<sup>3</sup> p. 110), and appear in the forms *itan est? fugitivosne est? satin habes?* etc. On the other hand, of the 60 cases in questions there are scarcely half a dozen in which *non* could be taken with any one word. It is true that it very frequently stands just before a personal pronoun, *ego, tu, me, mihi*, but it does not negative the pronoun, nor would the pronoun be emphatic if the sentence were declarative. This seems rather to be another instance of the expression of the personal pronoun under the influence of the interrogative inflection, and its presence and close connection with *non* strengthen the hypothesis that this form of sentence is properly interrogative, not exclamatory like (a) and (b). *non* is placed first in order that it may go with the whole sentence (= "is it not true that . . . ?").

Schrader gives 24 cases in Pl. and Ter. of *nonne*; of these 19 have the verb late, 4 contain only *nonne* and the verb, and only one (Ps. 1317 *nonne audes . . .*) has *non* and the verb together. In later Latin also, so far as I have been able to examine, *nonne* comes first and the verb at the end. I should therefore regard this third form of the *non* sentence as a true interrogation and the source of the *nonne* questions.

To this distinction *non* with pres. indic. 1st sing. seems to be an exception. Whatever its form, it has generally the meaning of *nonne*.

3. *non* with the second pers. pres. indic., with impv. force. *non taces?* Amph. 700, Asin. 931, Bacch. 470 (*non tu t.*), 627, Cas. V 4, 14, Curc. 712, Men. 618, 1026, Merc. 211, 484, 754, Most. 734, Ph. 987, 1004; *non tu (hinc, istinc) abis?* Men. 516, Ps. 1196, St. 603, Eun. 799; *non mihi respondes?* And. 743, Ph. 992; *non te tenes?* Men. 824; *non manes?* Ph. 849; *non tu te cohibes?* *non te respicis?* Heaut. 919; *non omittitis?* Ad. 942; *non manum abstinēs?* Ad. 781; *non tu tibi istam praetruncari linguam largiloquam iubes?* Mil. 318. *non taces?* Ps. 889 (B, Goetz); I prefer *non places* (CD, Lor.) Pl. 17, Ter. 10.

That these have impv. effect is shown by the reply *taceam?* Bacch. 627, Ph. 987, as if after *tace*. But the questioning effect

is also felt, as appears from the other form of answer *non* (*hercle vero*) *taceo*, Cas. V 4, 14, Curc. 912, Men. 618. These do not differ in any essential point from other questions with *non*, and something of impv. force may be felt in *non vides* (cf. *videsne*), *non tu scis* and even in *non licet*.

4. Other negatives used in questions without a particle are these:

*nil. nil respondes?* Ad. 641, Eun. 152, Poen. 259. These are like *non taces?* with an impv. effect. The other cases of *nihil* are all in Ter., Ad. 244, And. 949, Eun. 735, Hec. 462, 811; I should add Cas. prol. 78 and Merc. 912, generally punctuated with period.

*nullus*, Bacch. 718, Ps. 294, 1002; *nemo*, Ad. 529; *neque . . . neque*, Amph. 756, Pers. 131. Pl. 6 [8], Ter. 8.

The negative word in these sentences (except *nil respondes?*) is not at the beginning of the sentence and has no effect upon the question. Its presence is accidental, and the questions are like other forms of interrogative sentence without particle, with which they might have been classed.

#### E.—QUESTIONS WITH *iam* AND *etiam*.

Questions without a particle, having *iam* at or very near the beginning, occur 50 times, beside two (Ad. 700) without verb. In most of these *iam* has the same sense as in declarative sentences. Thus *iam ferio foris?* Men. 176 is "at once"; Merc. 222, *iam censes patrem abiisse a portu?* "by this time, already." So also with *nunc*, Ad. 290. With the perfect indic. the meaning "by this time, already, so soon" is quite distinct. In a few cases there is an approach to the impv. effect (cf. *etiam*). Merc. 884, *prehende. iam tenes?* || *teneo*. || *tene*. Most. 836, *iam vides?* Closely connected with this is a kind of assertive force, as if the sentence were both interrogative and strongly declarative. So most cases of *iam tenes?* *iam vides?* *iam scis?*

There are also a few cases in which I can see no time-force. Pers. 25, *iam servi hic amant?* Ps. 472, *iam tibi mirum id videtur?* (Rit. num, Lor. an). Asin. 929, *iam subrupuisti pallam, quam scorto dares?*

The passages in which *iam* is found are, with pres. indic. 1st pers., Men. 176, Eun. 814; 2d pers., Amph. 798, Asin. 338, Capt. prol. 10 (incomplete vs. Bx. *iamne*), Cist. II 3, 69, Epid. 25, 401, Merc. 222, 884, Most. 836 [III 2, 154 is a mere repetition], Pers.

528, 589, Poen. 578, Trin. 780 (*tenes iam?*), Truc. 881, Ad. 290, Eun. 703, 1016; fut., Heaut. 350; perf., Amph. 962, Asin. 929, Cas. II 3, 34, Merc. 658, Mil. 1344, Most. 668, Pers. 483 (MSS *an iam*), 484, Rud. 1386, St. 317, Trin. 912, Truc. 378. Third pers. pres., Pers. 25, 485, Poen. 590, Ps. 472, St. 529, Truc. 508 (twice), Ad. 388, Eun. 704; perf., Amph. 957, Asin. 410, 437, 638, Merc. 823, Mil. 1429, And. 806, Ph. 525, 796. The text is doubtful in Rud. 1383, 1369. Ad. 700 is without verb. Ph. 22 with period.

Pl. 40, Ter. 10.

With *etiam* the case is somewhat similar. It is used 68 times, and in many of these the sense does not differ from the uses well known in declarative sentences. Thus without time-force, "also, again," Asin. 677, *furcifer, etiam me delusisti?* Amph. 394, *etiam denuo*, Amph. 702, *etiam tu quoque*, Bacch. 127, *etiam me advorsus*, Epid. 711, Mil. 1206, Pers. 849, St. 427, Poen. 1234, Rud. 817, Ad. 243, 246, Ph. 769, Merc. 538, *etiam nunc*, Merc. 829, Ph. 931, And. 644, Eun. 286, 710 (but with a redundant syllable; Umpf. Dz. om. *nunc*). With time-force, "still, yet," Merc. 129, *at etiam asto?* *at etiam cesso . . .?* St. 574, *etiam valet?*

There are a few cases in which I do not see that *etiam* has any proper meaning. Bacch. 216, *sed Bacchis etiam fortis tibi visast?* cf. Mil. Glor. 1106, *ecquid fortis visast?* Most. 553, *etiam fatetur de hospite?* Pers. 651, *emam [cam], opinor.* || *etiam 'opinor'?*

The remaining cases all have the verb in 2d pers. pres. indic., and are of two distinct and well defined classes. First, *etiam* with or without *ne* is used to express an impv. So *etiam (tu) taces?* Curc. 41, Pers. 152, Trin. 514, 790, Ad. 550, *dicis* Pers. 278, *etiam quid respondetis mihi?* Bacch. 670; other cases are Bacch. 1168, Curc. 189, Aul. 255, Asin. 715, Pers. 275, 413, 542, Most. 383, Heaut. 235, Ph. 542. Also *acceptura es*, Rud. 469, and possibly Most. 513 (Lor.<sup>2</sup> *etiam tu fuge*, but the dialogue is confused). Also Men. 422, *etiam parasitum manes?* which Langen does not include.

Pl. 16, Ter. 3.

Second, *etiam* is used with the 2d pers. pres. in an exclamatory sentence. So *etiam rogas?* (Pl. 2, Ter. 3), *etiam rogitas?* (Pl. 3), given above under IV C. These, like *rogas?* alone, sum up a previous sentence, and *etiam* does not mean "again" or "still, yet," since the preceding question is frequently the first that has been asked. In some of the following cases *etiam* might be taken to mean "still" or "again." Merc. 896, *etiam metuis?* "are you still afraid?" Merc. 982, *etiam loquere?* "you still speak!" But

in most cases no such sense is possible, and these questions so closely resemble those given under IV C that it is difficult to draw any line between them. So *etiam minilare?* Bacch. 785, Truc. 621; *male loquere*, Pers. 290; *male loqui audes*, Capt. 563; *quaeris*, Merc. 981; *mones*, Bacch. 910; *muttis*, Amph. 381, Pers. 827; *inrides*, Most. 1132; *derides*, Men. 499; *clamas*, Amph. 376; *negas*, Merc. 763 (IV C); *rides*, Eun. 1017. In the following the sense of "still" is possible or probable: Merc. 728, 896, 982, Rud. 877, Trin. 572, 708, 991, Eun. 668, Hec. 430, 507. Also Most. 851, *at etiam restas?* (Rit. *restas*: Lor.<sup>3</sup> *restat*:)

Pl. 20, Ter. 4.

Andr. 849 should be *responde*, Rud. 733 is entirely confused, Rud. 711 might be included with the preceding, but is generally marked with a period. Bacch. 321, *etiam dimidium censes?* is condemned by Langen, p. 161, but retained, rightly, as I think, by Goetz.

Pl. 54, Ter. 14.

As has been said, there are about 900 questions without a particle in Pl. and Ter.; it now appears that more than 100 of these begin with *iam* and *etiam*. This raises two questions: (1) Were *iam* and *etiam* put at the beginning of the sentence, as *non* appears to have been, under the influence of the interrogative inflection? (2) Or did they, being already at the beginning of the sentence, take on an interrogative function?

As to the first question, a rough count shows that there are about 100 cases of *iam* in declarative sentences in the Amph., Asin., Aul. and Capt. In 30 of these *iam* goes with a subordinate verb or clause; of the remaining 70 about 40 have *iam* at the beginning. For *etiam* I have made no count, but believe the facts to be about the same. It appears likely, therefore, that the position of *iam* and *etiam* is not peculiar to questions, but is common to interrogative and declarative sentences.

The second question could be more surely answered if there were any discussion of the early uses of *iam* and *etiam*. The 42 cases of *iam* in declarative sentences are divided as to persons and tenses as follows:

	Pres.	Impf.	Fut.	Perf.	Pres. subj.	
1st pers.	8	...	14	2	I	= 25
2d pers.	1	I	...	...	...	= 2
3d pers.	9	...	6	...	...	= 15
	18	I	20	2	I	= 42

In questions as follows :

	Pres.	Fut.	Perf.	
1st pers.	2 (fut. sense)	...	...	= 2
2d pers.	17	1	12	= 30
3d pers.	9	...	9	= 18
	<hr/> 28	<hr/> 1	<hr/> 21	<hr/> = 50

Here is a marked tendency to use *iam* with the first pers. and the fut. in declarative sentences, but with the 2d pers. and the perf. in questions, the 3d pers. and the pres. remaining unchanged. This appears to indicate that *iam* expressed a kind of impatience or urgency, which I suppose to be connected with its use "in contrast with the time at which something was expected" (Harper's Lex., s. v., I. A, 2). A similar assertive force is plain in *etiam*, "and even, even," and in its use in answers, "just so, yes indeed." From the contrast between this subjective standard, which *iam* and *etiam* express, and the actual occurrence result the peculiar uses of these words in questions. Thus *etiam tu taces?* means "Are you keeping still at last? I should have expected it long ago." *etiam dicis ubi?* "Are you going to tell me at once? I asked you long ago." With *iam* this impv. force is much less distinct, but cf. Merc. 884, *prehende. iam tenes?* || *teneo*, || *tene*, with Pers. 413 ff., *accipin . . . ? accipe sis . . . tene sis . . . etiam tu . . . tenes?* So in *iam scis?* *iam vides?* there is a kind of challenge or demand, in which the expression of contrast is more important than the idea of time; "*now* you know, *now* you see, don't you? though before you didn't."

Langen says, Beitr. 160, in commenting upon Bacch. 319, with Ussing's note '*etiam* interrogantis,' "*etiam* hat aber in der Frage sonst immer seine besondere Bedeutung, hier würde es zu einer blossen Fragepartikel herabsinken." Below on the same page he says that the only case where *etiam* serves merely to give a special shading to the question is the impv. use. I have called attention above to some instances of *iam* (Pers. 25, Ps. 472, Asin. 929) and *etiam* (Bacch. 216, Most. 553, Pers. 651), mostly with the 3d pers., in which I can see no individual meaning for these words, where they seem to me "der Frage eine besondere Nüance zu geben," to use Langen's words. To these I should now add *etiam rogas, rogitas, minitare, negas*, etc., as being questions in which *etiam* has at the most only the meaning "actually, really,"

or, better expressed, has so far lost its proper sense as to serve merely to give a particular shade of meaning to the question, to make the question urgent and impatient and exclamatory. That is, *etiam* has almost and *iam* has less frequently assumed interrogative functions.<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that *iam* is used without *ne* 50 times, with *ne* 38, while *etiam*, having more interrogative effect in itself, is used without *ne* 68 times, with *ne* only 26 times.

F.—CONTINUED, SUPPLEMENTARY, AND INTRODUCTORY  
QUESTIONS.

Similar in a general way to the partially interrogative sentences given above are certain forms of incomplete questions, which depend upon either a preceding or a following sentence. These for the most part explain themselves, and no full lists of them are given, but it seems worth while to point out their relation to and possible influence upon other forms of question.

1. To a previous question the speaker himself adds a second thought, either in a phrase or a clause, in order to define the main question more precisely.

The added words may follow the question immediately, and be so clearly a part of it as to make it doubtful whether all should not be considered one question. Ps. 617 ff., *esne tu an non es ab illo militi Macedonio? servos eius, qui . . . est mercatus . . . dederat . . . debet?* Mil. 994 f., *numquis hic prope adest, qui rem alienam potius curet quam suam? qui . . . ancupet? qui . . . vivat?* So Men. 380, Poen. 557 ff., Rud. 1185, St. 97, Eun. 46 f., 794, Hec. 676, Ph. 156.

More frequently the continuation is added after an interruption or a reply by the second speaker. In this case the interruption may be almost entirely neglected, as in Poen. 879 f., *scin tu erum tuom meo ero esse inimicum capitalem?* || *scio.* || *propter amorem?* Ph. 739, *quis hic loquitur?* || *Sophrona.* || *et meum nomen nominat?* Or the speaker may continue his question because the reply was inadequate, or because he desires to make his question more precise and so compel a different answer. Aul. 773, *dic bona fide: tu id aurum non subrupuisti?* || *bona.* || *neque scis quis id abstulerit?* || *istuc quoque bona.* Ps. 484 f., *ecquas viginti minas paritas ut auferas a me?* || *aps te ego auferam?* || *ita: quas meo*

<sup>1</sup> In Bacch. 670, *etiam quid respondetis mihi?* the indef. *quid* is used after *etiam* exactly as it is used after the recognized particles *num*, *ec*- and *an*.

*gnato des, qui amicam liberet?* See esp. Rud. IV 8 (1265 ff.) Other examples are Most. 974 ff., Poen. 725, 732, Heaut. 894, etc.—about 30 in all. In some cases the continuation begins with *at*, correcting the previous question, and this may make the continuation amount in sense to a new question, though in the form of the original question. Heaut. 973, *ere, licetne?* || *loquere.* || *at tuto?* (all edd. use period). St. 342, *ecquem convenisti?* || *multos.* || *at virum?* Hec. 804, *es tu Myconius?* || *non sum.* || *at Callidemides?* The string of names in Trin. 916 f. is entirely similar, though *at* is not used.

When the original sentence is a *quis*-question, the second part is not so closely dependent upon the main sentence, but it implies, in the full logical expression of the thought, a repetition of the leading verb. Amph. prol. 52, *quid contraxistis frontem?* *quia tragoediam dixi futuram hanc?* Pers. 718, *quo illum sequar?* *in Persas?* *nugas.* About half a dozen cases.

In all continued questions the previous speech is itself a question, and in the words added by the same speaker there is no real interrogative force. They take over the interrogation, with whatever shading of genuine desire for information, of rejection or of exclamation it may have, from the main question. This fact sufficiently explains the absence of an interrogative particle.

2. Resembling these in form but differing essentially in character are the semi-interrogative phrases or clauses which supplement a remark made by the other speaker. In these the interrogation, so far as there is any, is not in the words but in the unexpressed idea, "Do you mean your remark in this way,—if this idea is added?" Hec. 809, *dic me orare ut veniat.* || *ad te?* "(Do you mean) to you?" Heaut. 778, *argentum dabitur ei ad nuptias, aurum atque vestem qui—tenesne?* || *comparet?* "get ready, do you mean?" Amph. 805, *ego accubui simul.* || *in eodem lecto?* || *in eodem.* Aul. 148, Ad. 536, Heaut. 905—about 12 in all. A relative clause may be added in this way, either with (see I. K.) or without *ne*. So Epid. 700, Mil. 973, with Brix's note, Ad. 530, Heaut. 1018.

There are a few places where a brief question is added, not depending upon what has been said, but using the framework of the previous sentence. Ph. 209, *quin abeo?* || *et quidem ego?* Rud. 1161, *ubi loci sunt spes meae?* || *immo edepol meae?* With these I should class a few brief demands, consisting of a word or two and immediately connected with the previous remark. Andr.

928, *ibi mortuost.* || *eius nomen?* Eun. 317, *color verus, corpus solidum*— || *anni?* Eun. 810.

Here belong finally all questions with *si* (*sin, verum si, at si, etsi*). Ph. 492, *nondum mihi credis?* || *ariolare.* || *sin fidem do?* Cf. esp. And. 348, *nuptiae mi*— || *etsi scio?* || *hodie*— || *optundis, tam etsi intellego?* About 10 cases.

3. If the main verb is in the second part of the question, then the first part may shrink away into an almost meaningless phrase, whose only function is to introduce with vividness the main question. This is the case with *ain?* which introduces an exclamatory repetition, with *audin?* introducing a command, and sometimes with *scin tu?* Also *quid?* is used most frequently before exclamations, *quid nunc?* before questions, and *quid ais?* before regular and somewhat formal questions. All of these occur often before questions without a particle, and it is probable that these words of themselves marked the following sentence as interrogative and made the particle unnecessary. In the same way, when two independent questions of similar form are used together, *ne* in the first would suffice for both; cf. Capt. 139, *egone illum non fleam? ego non defleam . . .?* with Brix's note. These are only continued questions, in which the second part has a main verb and has become grammatically independent, but is still so far dependent as to have no separate sign of interrogation.<sup>1</sup>

E. P. MORRIS.

<sup>1</sup> Continued questions are common in Pl., but interruptions and supplementary phrases seem to be used much more frequently by Ter.

### III.—BEGINNINGS OF THE "CLASSICAL" HEROIC COUPLET IN ENGLAND.

In the year 1885 Mr. Edmund Gosse published a series of collected essays under the title "From Shakespeare to Pope." They had been delivered as lectures before the Johns Hopkins University, and elsewhere in America, the previous year. The argument of these lectures (and the author takes great pride in the irrefragability of the "links of the argument," as his subsequent preface shows) culminated in the following assertions: "I do not myself believe, or see any reason for suspecting, that the change to classicism in England was originally started by direct influence from France any more than from Germany, or from Holland, or from Spain" (p. 17). "I do not believe that Waller was in the very smallest degree affected by the French revolt against the poetry of the renaissance when he opened his campaign against the romantic school at home. I am persuaded that it was the result of one of those atmospheric influences which disturb the tradition of literature simultaneously, and in all the countries of Europe alike, and that it was a much more blind and unconscious movement than that which towards the close of the eighteenth century impelled all the literatures of Europe to throw off the chains which they had adopted one hundred and fifty years before" (p. 19).

Mr. Gosse's grounds for the first assertion are given in the form of a statement of fact; and it must be acknowledged that there is a tradition of two hundred years' standing to recommend it: "Waller was writing poems in distichs, which were often as good as Dryden's ever became, at least as early as 1623" (p. 18), while "Malherbe's poems did not appear in Paris till 1630, two years after his death." "A few of his pieces had come to light [before Waller wrote], but he had issued no book; he was only a fructifying centre of influence."

It will be observed that we have here two assertions and one statement of fact. The latter is the date of Malherbe's death and that of the issue of his poems. The unsupported assertion is that

<sup>1</sup> Cambridge. At the University Press. The citations in this paper are made from the New York edition, 1885.

Malherbe was only a "fructifying centre of influence," or, as he puts it (p. 18) more plainly: "Malherbe, with whom by universal consent the fashion for correct versifying and the exclusion of ornament set in, was not at this time a poet known even to the French public." Finally, the statement supported by English tradition, *and by this alone*, is to the effect that Waller began writing at least as early as 1623.

Before taking up the questions affecting England it may not be amiss to examine the statements concerning Continental literature. Mr. Gosse now and then speaks of changes which cannot be understood "merely by a reference to our local schools of poetry in England" (p. 13); but a little preliminary consideration will show that there is no real comparative study in his book. On page 17 the admission is made that "at the final decline of the Renaissance it was France that stood at the intellectual head of Europe." But our author finds in this simply an explanation of the fact that the "movement began first in France." In the case of Holland, the point at issue is avoided by what might be called a denial of the major premise; that is, it is denied that there ever had been, properly speaking, any romantic poetry at all in Holland, and it is asserted that Vondel accomplished the change to "classicism" by "polishing the execution of their [of the Dutch] verses." Finally, in the case of Germany, no mention is made of French influence except in the single phrase, "he (Opitz) took his cue directly from Holland and France." But this is only a saving clause, and has no part in his argument. Opitz is made to sound the first note of change in 1617, and, as far as Mr. Gosse is concerned, the matter begins and ends here. Opitz is essentially an autochthon, and is "as rigidly classical, didactic, and anti-romantic as it is possible to be."

This whole representation of the state of things in Holland and Germany is unsatisfactory. Heinsius,<sup>1</sup> who was at this time to Holland what Opitz was to Germany, is not even mentioned. Vondel's services to Dutch literature were of course very great, but the mention of him in *this* connection is unfortunate. For while Heinsius, though borrowing largely from Ronsard, rejected the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. B. Muth, Ueber das Verhältniss von Martin Opitz zu Dan. Heinsius, Leipziger Diss., 1872, p. 30; Dr. G. Witkowski, Martin Opitzens Aristarchus, Leipzig, 1888, p. 6. The dissertation of R. Beckherrn, Martin Opitz, P. Ronsard und Daniel Heinsius, Königsberg, 1888, was not accessible.

latter's authority as to the *vers communs*,<sup>1</sup> and elected the Alexandrine, it was Vondel who, in 1659, in his 'Jephte,' introduced in his tragedies the verse of ten syllables, *in deference to the authority of Ronsard*.<sup>2</sup>

For Germany it will be sufficient to amend Mr. Gosse's picture by a reference to the following authorities. For Opitz' enormous and direct obligations to Heinsius cf. Dr. Karl Borinski, *Die Poetik der Renaissance*, Berlin, 1886, pp. 61-62; and C. W. Berghoeffer, *Martin Opitz' Buch von der deutschen Poeterei*, Frankfurt a.-M., 1888, pp. 34-36, 43. His relation to Ronsard is discussed by Otto Fritsch, *Martin Opitzens Buch von der deutschen Poeterei, Ein kritischer Versuch*, Halle, 1884, p. 76 f. Not even was Opitz' national patriotism in poetical matters original; it was kindled at the French patriotism of Ronsard (Fritsch, p. 31). The assertion that Opitz' couplets were "strictly classical in taste"<sup>3</sup> must mean "classical" in the sense in which the word is employed elsewhere in the book; that is, as characterizing the end-stopped couplet. How far this is from the truth is seen in Opitz' own words.<sup>4</sup>

The conclusion forced upon us by this review of Mr. Gosse's brief survey of the condition of literature on the Continent in the second decade of the seventeenth century, is that his estimate of French influence on European literature at this time is lower than the facts warrant. In this way the reform in each country is made to appear quite spontaneous, and Waller's title as originator of a school of literature in England is rendered doubly secure.

Returning then to England, two things arrest our attention, before all others: indifference as to the origin of the "classical" couplet, and a curious persistence of the tradition above referred

<sup>1</sup> But cf. Ronsard, *Œuvres Complètes*, VII 330 f.

<sup>2</sup> 'Naar dien de edele heer Ronsard, de vorst der Fransche dichteren, deze dichtmaet hooghdravender oordeelt, en beter van zenuwen voorzien, en gesteven dan d'Alexandrijnsche, van twalef en dertien lettergreepen, die, zooveel langer, naer zijn voordeel flaeuwer vallen en meer op ongebonde rede trekken.' *Werken*, door J. van Lennep, VIII, 1863, p. 16. Vondel was no stranger to the couplet before 1659, but the verse he habitually makes use of is the Alexandrine.

<sup>3</sup> From Shakespeare to Pope, p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> "So ist es auch nicht von nöthen, das der periodus oder sentenz allzeit mit dem verse oder der strophe sich ende: ja es stehet zierlich, wann er zum wenigsten biss zue des andern, dritten, vierdten verses, auch des ersten in der folgenden strophe Caesur behalten wird." *Deutsche Poeterei*, ed. Witkowski, p. 185; cf. also Ronsard, *Œuvres*, III 26.

to, that this form of verse is far more beholden to Waller for its introduction and first development than to any other English poet.

In October 1886 a writer in the *Quarterly Review*, who subsequently disclosed himself as Churton Collins, published a violent attack on Mr. Gosse and his book. This was based upon a considerable number of errors in detail, and not only attracted wide attention, but aroused violent discussion in a legion of journals.

But in all this discussion, the theory and the assertions cited above were either not mentioned at all, or were dealt with in a summary and uncritical fashion. The *Quarterly Reviewer* actually rejects as "not practical" the question of the influence of Continental literature upon that of England. His reason is, partly, because "English literature can never be studied properly, unless it be studied in connection with the literature of Greece and Rome," but chiefly, because it is not to be expected that a student should "read, in addition to Greek and Latin, half-a-dozen other languages, and among those languages . . . *Anglo-Saxon and German*" (p. 322). It is difficult to understand Mr. Collins' position in regard to the classical couplet. He does not appear to recognize the existence of that metrical form as distinguished from the Elizabethan rhymed couplet. An instance of the rashness of his statements is this, that Geo. Sandys "wrote heroic couplets simply indistinguishable from Pope's couplets" (p. 304). This is literary criticism "by and large." We shall see below that Sandys' couplets are simply and easily *distinguishable* from those of Pope. The discussion aroused by the *Quarterly Review* article produced absolutely no critical result.

And now, in 1889, in "A History of Eighteenth Century Literature" (London and New York), Mr. Gosse enters the field again with a series of statements, chastened in form, but with unabated clearness and pretension.

"The most obvious phenomenon connected with the change of poetry was the gradual substitution, in non-dramatic verse, . . . of a single normal instrument of versification, namely, the neatly balanced *and unbroken* heroic couplet" (p. 2).<sup>1</sup>

"Waller, without apparently any ambition to restore the couplet as Chaucer had left it, nor, on the other hand, any suggestion from France, where the Alexandrine was not yet subjected to a like

<sup>1</sup> "I must insist upon the fact that the principle of the structure of romantic poetry was overflow, that of the classical poetry was distich." From Shakespeare to Pope, p. 47.

reform, revised and strengthened this form of verse, and gave it the character which it retained for no less than one hundred and fifty years" (p. 3).

Let us pause to consider what this means. A youth of eighteen years, still "living in his mother's house in Buckinghamshire," acting upon some impulse or instinct, or enlightenment, writes verses not only of perfect harmony and cadence, but also according to a new principle of structure. Unsupported during many years, and yet persistent, he obtains in 1642 (about twenty years) his first disciple. His earliest verses were not only as good as any he wrote during the course of his long life, they were also better of that kind than any which his contemporaries succeeded in producing. This young man, then, in the manner indicated, set the fashion in English literature. He did more; he fixed the type for one hundred and fifty years. The matter has even been taken up by historians, and we find so capital an authority on the seventeenth century in England as Mr. S. R. Gardiner thus generalizing on Waller's great deed:<sup>1</sup> "Something, no doubt, of that great law of reaction by which the courses of humanity are governed is visible in the adoption, by one whose own life was so dissolute as to cast off all moral restraints, of a scheme of poetry of which the chief characteristic is the subordination of independent thought and fancy to the severest artificial laws of style. Yet, even in this respect Waller was floating on a tide which ran with a greater sweep than could be accounted for by the peculiarities of his individual character." In a note Mr. Gardiner adds: "My own knowledge of the history of poetic form is extremely slight, but I suppose, speaking under correction, that the recent critics of Mr. Gosse, by whose work these paragraphs were suggested, will allow so much to Waller." The generalization is superb, and the fact must be allowed, but is Waller entitled to this extraordinary distinction? The answer must be sought for in his works.

The poem which heads the list in most editions of Waller<sup>2</sup> is entitled "Of the Danger His Majesty (being Prince) Escaped in the Road at St. Andero," and contains 170 lines in couplets. Charles I is represented embarking off Santander in Spain, after

<sup>1</sup> S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War*, Vol. I, London, 1886, pp. 9-10.

<sup>2</sup> The editions of Waller which were used in preparing the present paper are: London, 1729, ed. Mr. Fenton, 4to; London, 1730, ed. Mr. Fenton, 8vo; and the edition by Robt. Bell, London, 1854, 8vo. Unfortunately, none of the earlier editions were accessible.

his dubious wooing of the Infanta at Madrid, in 1623. The argument is afforded by the fortunate rescue of the barge in which the Prince was, when it was in danger of being swept out of the open roadstead by a sudden squall off shore. There is much mythology of feminine eyes and influences in the poem:

"And dear remembrance of that fatal glance,  
For which he lately pawned his heart in France.

When France shall boast of her whose conquering eyes  
Have made the best of English hearts their prize."

Mr. Gosse in some incredible way has misread the poem, when a single glance at Dr. Johnson's life of Waller would have set him right. "The dubious and coy position of the Infanta . . . is lightly touched" (p. 49). But the Infanta is not even referred to. The "fatal glance" is owned by the French Princess Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV. Charles had seen her, but by no means "pawned his heart" to her, while travelling incognito through France, a few months before, to reach Spain and the Infanta.<sup>1</sup> The marriage between Charles and Henrietta Maria had been talked of in January 1624, but the whole matter was disavowed by its promoters, Buckingham and Marie de Médicis, as soon as it was noised abroad.<sup>2</sup> That a time-serving poet like Waller, who risked his art only on certainties, should have written the piece at this time is impossible. The marriage treaty was signed in November, the dispensation for it granted in Rome in December, and the marriage itself took place May 1, 1625, after Charles had ascended the throne. All Waller's commentators have dated the poem 1623. Fenton (1730) wishes to prove by the date that "Waller began to write only twenty-five years after the death of Spenser." Gosse conjures up the following dramatic situation: "It was distinctly an inspiration for a lad of eighteen, in the winter of 1623, when Ben Jonson, and Chapman, and Drayton were the poets most in vogue, resolutely to sit down without a model to write a long poem on the exciting incident of the moment, the danger Prince Charles had just escaped on his return voyage from Spain" (pp. 48-9). Dr. Johnson<sup>3</sup> stands alone in the opinion that the piece "could not have been the sudden effu-

<sup>1</sup> S. R. Gardiner, *Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage*, Vol. II, 1869, p. 303.

<sup>2</sup> S. R. Gardiner, *History of England under the Duke of Buckingham and Charles I*, Vol. I, 1875, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> *Lives of the Poets*, London (Warne & Co.), n. d., pp. 96-7.

sion of fancy, and must have been written after the event." A careful reading of the poem, with the attested fact in mind that Waller composed slowly and painfully, and kept his pieces long by him,<sup>1</sup> must convince any unprejudiced reader that Dr. Johnson is right. The poem cannot have been written before 1625, and was more probably—for reasons which will appear later on—produced later still.

With two or three exceptions, to be presently mentioned, there is no evidence that Waller wrote anything further before 1635. And there is direct evidence to the contrary. Lord Clarendon, in his *Life*, has given us a complete picture of Waller.<sup>2</sup> "He had the good fortune to have an alliance and friendship with Dr. Morley, who had assisted and instructed him in the reading many good books, to which his natural parts and promptitude inclined him, especially the poets; and at the age when other men used to give over writing verses (for he was near thirty years when he first engaged himself in that exercise, at least that he was known to do so), he surprised the town with two or three pieces of that kind, as if a tenth muse had been born to cherish drooping poetry. The doctor (Morley) at that time brought him into that company, which was most celebrated for good conversation, etc."

Dr. Morley,<sup>3</sup> afterwards Bp. of Winchester, was a great student, and had distinguished friends. It is furthermore known that he lived in Waller's house at Beaconsfield several years, and assisted him in his literary studies. The circle to which Waller was introduced was the famous one which gathered around Lord Falkland at Great Tew, twelve miles from Oxford.<sup>4</sup> Falk-

<sup>1</sup> Five couplets written in the Tasso of Her Royal Highness (Fenton's ed., 1730, p. 175) are said on the authority of the Duke of Buckingham to have cost Waller the greater part of a summer, in composition and correction.

<sup>2</sup> *Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon*. Vol. I. Oxford, 1827, pp. 53-54.

<sup>3</sup> The story that Waller discovered and befriended Morley, and introduced him to the literary circle, is so evidently a fabrication as to be scarcely deserving of mention; cf. Bell's edition of Waller's *Poems* (1854), p. 18, note.

<sup>4</sup> The exact date at which Falkland's life at Great Tew began is not known. He returned from Ireland "when he was about the age of eighteen years" (Clarendon, I 42), as the heir of his grandfather, and became possessor of the manor at the death of his grandmother, which "fell out about the time that he was nineteen years of age" (p. 43). But it is clear that he may have kept open house there before her death. This, together with the probability that he was born, not in 1610, as commonly assumed, but in 1609 (S. R. Gardiner, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* IX 246), makes 1627 not too early a date for the beginning of his hospitalities at Great Tew.

land, himself no great poet, but confessedly a good judge of poetry,<sup>1</sup> and one of the foremost men of his time in character, was the hospitable centre around which these bright spirits of Old and New England revolved. Ben Jonson was a frequent visitor, and other members were Clarendon, then a young law student "at gaze," John Earle of Oxford, Dr. Morley, and Geo. Sandys. Clarendon's attitude towards Lord Falkland is well known; he makes him the centre and hero of his history. It is therefore reasonably certain that Clarendon must have exactly known the members of the literary set around Lord Falkland, "their exits and their entrances," and must have been in some degree acquainted with their pretensions in literature. Waller cannot have begun producing his occasional pieces after 1627, and it is extremely probable that Clarendon, who was no poet, did not share in the intimate literary discussions of the circle. Certain poems of Waller, when passed around and commented on, might therefore escape his notice, and he might even err by a few years in the matter of Waller's appearance as a poet. But he could never have mistaken a youth of eighteen for a man of thirty. His characteristic of Waller remains, as a whole, in force as a vivid personal reminiscence, and places him in just that light in Falkland's circle which the new evidence, about to be introduced, demands. From Aubrey, we have only the testimony that "Waller was very much admired at Court before the late civil warres."<sup>2</sup>

In the course of a careful search for references to Waller in the works of the company of writers around Lord Falkland, the "Characters" of Bishop Earle have furnished unexpected material. John Earle, born 1600, was Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, Chaplain to the Prince of Wales, an exile in Holland, and (after the Restoration) Bishop of Worcester, and finally Bishop of Salisbury. He died in the year 1665. Clarendon says of him:<sup>3</sup> "He was an excellent poet, both in Latin, Greek, and English, as appears by many pieces yet abroad; though he suppressed many more himself, especially of English, incomparably good, out of austerity to those sallies of his youth. He was very dear to the Lord Falkland, with whom he spent as much time as he could make his own." From some lines of his on Francis Beaumont,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lord Falkland's Poems, in Fuller Worthies Miscellanies, Vol. 3, ed. Rev. A. B. Grosart.

<sup>2</sup> Lives of Eminent Men, Vol. II, 1813, p. 564.

<sup>3</sup> Life, Vol. I. Oxford, 1827, p. 58.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Beaumont and Fletcher, ed. Geo. Darley, London, 1872, p. lvii.

which cannot have been composed after Earle was twenty years of age, it is possible to form an opinion of his poetic tastes. The tone of the verses is far deeper and fuller than that of the ordinary poetical panegyric.

"Such strength, such sweetness couched in every line,  
Such life of fancy, such high choice of brain,  
Naught of the vulgar wit or borrowed strain;

And these so unaffectedly expressed,  
All in a language purely flowing dressed;  
And all so born within thyself, thine own,  
So new, so fresh, so nothing trod upon."

It is evident that Earle, at least as a young man, found his ideal of poetical expression in the romantic poetry of the period of James I. That he was fastidious appears from Aubrey's remark that Earle "would not allow Lord Falkland to be a good poet, though a great wit." His ability as a poet is further attested by "Lines on Sir John Burroughs," and "On the Death of the Duke of Pembroke."<sup>1</sup> The work of Earle which is of importance for our present purpose is entitled "Microcosmographie, or a Peece of the World Discovered," and was first published in three editions in 1628 (London). The first edition in the present century (ed. Bliss, 1811) was followed in 1868 by Mr. Arber's Reprint. In 1871 a manuscript of the work was discovered at Durham, differing very considerably from the first printed editions, and containing the colophon: "Ffinis. December, this 14th day, 1627." Rev. J. T. Fowler has published a collation of this MS with Arber's Reprint, in Notes and Queries, Fourth Series, VIII and IX.

No. 24 in the list of "Characters" [No. 22 in the Durham MS], is entitled

*A Pot-Poet*<sup>2</sup>

Is the dreggs of wit; yet mingled with good drinke may haue some relish.  
*His Inspirations are more reall than others; for they doe but faine a God, but hee has his by him.* His Verses run like the Tap, and his inuention as the Barrell,  
ebs and flowes at the mercy of the spiggot. In thin drinke he aspires not aboue

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Microcosmography, by John Earle, D. D., ed. Philip Bliss (1811). First American edition, ed. L. L. Williams, Albany, 1867, pp. 169-171.

<sup>2</sup> The passages in italics are additions to the MS, first found in the printed editions of 1628. The passage in brackets is not found in the edition of 1628, printed by W. S. for Ed. Blount. This edition (reproduced by Bliss in his edition of 1811, and collated with that of 1732) may therefore be earlier than that of the same year reprinted by Arber. But cf. Arber, p. 10.

a Ballad, but a cup of Sacke inflames him, and sets his Muse and Nose a fire together. The Presse is his Mint, and stamps him now and then a sixe pence or two in reward of the baser coyne of his Pamphlet. *His workes would scarce sell for three halfe pence, though they are giuen oft for three Shillings;*<sup>1</sup> but for the pretty Title that allures the Country Gentleman: and for which the Printer maintaines him in Ale a fortnight. His Verses are like his clothes, *miserable Cento's and patches, yet their pace is not altogether so hobling as an Almanacks.* The death of a great man or the *burning* of a house furnish him with an Argument, and the nine Muses are out strait in mourning *gowne*, and Melpomine cries Fire, Fire. [*His other Poems are but Briefs in Rime, and like the poore Greekes collections to redeeme from captiuitie.*] He is a man now much imploy'd in commendations of our Navy, and a bitter inueigher against the Spaniard. His frequent'st Workes goe out in single sheets, and are chanted from market to market, to a vile tune, and a worse throat: whilst the poore Country wench melts like her butter to heare them. And these are the Stories of some men of Tiburne, or a strange Monster out of Germany: or sitting in a Baudy-house, hee writes Gods Iudgements. He ends at last in some obscure painted Cloth, to which himselfe made the Verses, and his life like a Canne too full spils vpon the bench. He leaues twenty shillings on the score, which my Hostesse looses.

This characterization presents varied features, constantly recurring, which render it impossible to believe that the satire is directed against a type. Some individual poet is meant.<sup>2</sup> This is further strikingly confirmed by the careful re-editing (between December 1627 and 1628) of just those portions which contain the most unmistakable hits. Some obnoxious poet and character is here pilloried. It can scarcely be any other than Waller.

First in Waller's works, five poems have always stood, all poems of occasion. The order has not always been the same, for Fenton (p. xvi) complains in 1729 that the verses "To the King on his Navy," in all the editions since the Restoration, have the inconvenient date 1626 added to the title, whereas in his opinion

<sup>1</sup> For "His . . . Shillings," the Durham MS has "His workes neere exceede thre half pence, and would hardly sell so."

For "miserable . . . pace is," the Durham MS has "and raggs and patches get their footemanshippe"; for "hobling," "shuffling"; for "burning," "firing"; for "gowne," "cloaths"; for "His other . . . Spaniard," "At more leysur'd times he makes disticks on noblemen, which are put vnder their two-penny pictures that hang in the bookbinders' shops."

For "frequent'st," "commonest"; for "out in single," "forth in small"; for "ends," "drops away"; for "my Hostesse looses," "mine Host looseth."

<sup>2</sup> For a parallel, though immeasurably less clever, cf. "A Tippling Poetaster," in Follie's Anatomie, compiled by Henry Hutton, Dunelmensis, London, 1619 [cited by Brydges, Censura Literaria, II 406-7]. In this the Water Poet is plainly satirized.

the verses were written in 1635. Bell (1854) thinks the date of the piece uncertain. The writer in the *Quarterly Review*, October 1886 (p. 302, note), thinks it "may have been written as late as 1635." But no sufficient reasons have ever been adduced for this date, and we have the old editions with the date 1626 still to reckon with. No more striking correspondence of date can be imagined. A comparison of the Durham MS (finished Dec. 1627) with the accessible printed editions of 1628 shows that the passage in question was during that time twice re-edited. The words in the MS are: "At more leisur'd times he makes *disticks* on noble-men which are put under their twopenny pictures that hang in the bookbinders' shops." For this, the first edition in 1628 substitutes "He is a man now much imploy'd in commendations of our Nauy, and a bitter inueigher against the Spaniard." To this last, the second edition of 1628 prefixes: "His other Poems are but Briefs in Rime, and like the poore Greekes collections to redeeme from captiuity." The three passages are all extremely clever attacks upon Waller's poetry, both as to subject and form. We are forced to conclude that Waller had just descended upon the town "like a tenth muse" (to use Clarendon's phrase), when Earle is portraying him as the man "now much imploy'd in commendations of our Nauy."

The very first gibe of Earle, that "the death of a great man" furnishes his Pot-Poet "with an argument," finds its application in the verses which have usually occupied the second place in Waller's volume: "Of his Majesty's receiving the News of the Duke of Buckingham's Death." If the Durham MS contains the reference to "the death of a great man," and it would appear from Mr. Fowler's collation that it does contain them, then there is a difficulty in the date; for Buckingham was murdered August 23, 1628. The discrepancy is not to be explained, except on the supposition that Waller had written verses on a similar subject before, and that these have not come down to us. He himself notes the fact that one of his occasional poems was for many years lost (Fenton's ed., 1730, p. 144). As far as the printed editions are concerned, we venture to assume that the reference is to Waller, and that for the following reasons:

The duke's taking off was hailed with delight by the nation, and Waller's fulsome adulation of him in the poem as a limb lopped from the State and from Charles could not but excite attention and remonstrance. But the chief point is that the verses

are not an elegy, nor an epitaph. Such were common enough on the death of great men. The death of Buckingham actually furnishes the poet with his "argument," and the piece marks a new departure in English poetry. On this point Mr. Gosse may be cited (p. 69): "We have but to consider how difficult it would have been for one of the romantic poets to have proceeded with a theme like this" [he is speaking of another one of Waller's first five poems of occasion]. "It was very seldom that they would allow themselves to be entrapped into the treatment of public recent events."

That "Pot-Poet" had become in literature a general term of reproach, with no implication of booziness, is shown in the following passage from John Taylor, the Water Poet:

"But there's a kind of stealing mysticall,  
Pick-pocket wits, filch-lines sophisticall,  
Villaines in verse, base runagates in rime,  
False rob-wits, and contemned slaves of time,  
Purloyning Thieues, that pilfer from desart  
The due of study, and reward of art.  
*Pot-Poets*, that haue still to steale translations,  
And (into English) filch strange tongues and Nations,  
And change the language of good wits unknown,  
These Thieush rascals print them for their own."<sup>1</sup>

It remains to bring forward certain minor proofs which would establish nothing, if unsupported, but which are offered as corroborative evidence, without prejudice to the main argument.

In the Durham MS the Pot-Poet "drops away [ed. of 1628, 'ends'] at last in some obscure painted cloth." The printed editions add: "to which himself made the verses." 'Painted cloth' usually meant old tapestry hangings, or canvas painted in oil, on which scraps of verses were written. But it also signified such verses as part of the show in a masque. This is shown in Ben Jonson's *Expostulation with Inigo Jones*:<sup>2</sup>

"O shows, shows, mighty shows!  
The eloquence of masques! What need of prose,  
Or verse, or prose, t' express immortal you?  
You are the spectacle of state, 'tis true,  
Court-hieroglyphics, and all arts afford,  
In the mere perspective of an inch-board;

<sup>1</sup> Works, comprised in the Folio edition of 1630 [the date corresponds closely with that of Earle]. Spenser Soc., 1869, p. 281.

Ben Jonson's Works, Boston, 1869, p. 777.

You ask no more than certain politic eyes,  
Eyes that can pierce into the mysteries  
Of many colours, read them, and reveal  
Mythology, there painted on slit deal.  
Or to make boards to speak ! there is a task !  
Painting and carpentry are the soul of masque.  
Pack with your peddling poetry to the stage,  
This is the money-got mechanic age.

Almighty Architecture, who no less  
A goddess is, than painted cloth, deal board,  
Vermillion, lake, or crimson can afford  
Expression for. . . .  
What poesy ere was painted on a wall,  
That might compare with thee ?"

Among Waller's poems is an undated one entitled 'The Miser's Speech; in a Masque' [Fenton's ed. 1730, p. 86]. After referring to Atalanta and the golden balls, to Jupiter and Danae—subjects which were frequently represented in painted cloth—the poet brings in the story of Midas :

" 'Twas not revenge for griev'd Apollo's wrong,  
Those asse's ears on Midas' temples hung :  
But fond repentance of his happy wish,  
Because his meat grew metal like his dish.  
Would Bacchus bless me so, I'd constant hold  
Unto my wish, and die creating gold."

There are two considerations which point to this piece of Waller's as the one Earle had in mind. In the first place, the poet was not only rich, but had also the reputation of neglecting no opportunity of augmenting his fortune.<sup>1</sup> The stroke was therefore a fine one, to identify him with his miser in the masque, and, with the original character of the Pot-Poet in mind, to parody the words "I'd . . . die creating gold" by "He ends at last in some obscure painted cloth, to which himself made the Verses." The second consideration is drawn from the character of Midas, as understood in Bishop Earle's time. Geo. Sandys comments upon him in his *Ovid's Metamorphosis Englished* (ed. 1640, p. 213): "Midas signifies a foole . . . For Pan contending with Apollo in musick, the mountaine Tmolus being their Judge, gave the palme to Apollo : but sottish Midas protests against the sentence; for which Apollo produceth his eares to the length and

<sup>1</sup> Waller's Works, ed. Bell, 1854, p. 17.

instability of an Asse's. Pan presents illiterate rusticity; Apollo a minde imbued with the divine endowments of art and nature." Midas, appearing in the character of a contemner of good literature, may be well applied to the case in hand; for, if Earle ridiculed Waller at all, it was certainly in the character of a foolish perverter of literary style. The identification of Waller with his own painted-cloth hero, not only in his fate but in his character, would be quite of a piece with the rest of Earle's delineation, and seems in a high degree probable. The expression "in an *obscure* painted cloth" is suggestive. No masque, of which Waller's verses form a part, has been found, and it is extremely probable that the title should have been 'The Miser's Speech; appropriate to a Masque.' Earle could in any case fail to share Waller's opinion as to the character and merit of the piece, and could prefer to see in it the row of pictures on painted cloth, with the appropriate tags of verses.

From the foregoing digression, as well as from the main argument, to which we now return, it is evident that the class of themes chosen by Waller appeared to Earle, who had grown up in the nobler traditions of the preceding reign, quite unsuited to poetic treatment, and the treatment itself deserving of ridicule. The, to him, ludicrous similarity between such subjects of passing interest, and the themes with which the penny poets tried to catch the popular ear, suggested the idea of making the rich, courtly, temperate, but despicable Waller sit for his portrait. He appears to us, clad in the "centos and patches" of the drunken rhymers, from whom he would have revolted, and with whom he had nothing in common except the unpardonably unpoetic range of subject, the offending distich, and a liberal proportion of heathen mythology in every copy of verses.

Certain brief characteristics of John Earle have been handed down, which prove him capable of fine raillery. Wood (Ath. Oxon.) says of him: 'His younger years were adorned with oratory, poetry, and witty fancies; and his elder with quaint preaching and subtle disputes.' Clarendon (Life) reports: '[He was] of a conversation so pleasant and delightful, so very innocent, and so very facetious, that no Man's Company was more desired, and more loved.' In Waller's case, the painful difference apparent between his real character and his talent and pretensions excited frequent criticism. Aubrey relates: 'He had but a tender

<sup>1</sup> Lives of Eminent Men, Vol. II, 1813, p. 565.

weake body, but was always very temperate; but — made him damnable drunk at Somerset House, where at the water stayres he fell down, and had a cruel fall. 'Twas pity to use such a sweet swan so inhumanely." And finally, Clarendon tells us plainly that Waller was detested by the very men who welcomed him in their company for his pleasant society.

To sum up the whole argument: if Earle rallied Waller in 'A Pot-Poet,' it is possible to determine the date of composition of one, and perhaps two, of the undated poems. We are also able to get a far clearer idea of the interests of the literary circle, presided over by the immortal Lord Falkland, into which Dr. Morley introduced Waller.<sup>1</sup> It is also rendered extremely probable that Waller did not write in the couplet before 1626, and that it was introduced into the Falkland circle about 1627. Finally, as a result of the last point, if the kind of verse which "set the type in England for one hundred and fifty years" was produced in that country before 1626-7, it was not produced by Waller.

With the claim set up for Waller, that he wrote perfect couplets at a very early age, two assumptions have always been made: that the published editions do not vary, and that the poems as first published in 1645 are the exact pieces that Waller produced some eighteen years before, unchanged and unaltered. The first of these assumptions can be neither confirmed nor disproved without a careful study of the representative editions, beginning with those of 1645. Such a study and comparison appears never to have been made. The second assumption has never been proved, and can perhaps, owing to lack of evidence, never be successfully disputed. In the preface to the first edition after the Restoration (1664), Waller (signing himself Albinovanus) says that on his return from banishment he 'was troubled to find his name in print; but somewhat satisfied to see his lines so ill-rendered that he might justly disown them.' 'The many and gross faults' have, according to Waller, all been made by the printer. The latter is promptly castigated for his delinquencies, while the reader is

<sup>1</sup> The extraordinary intimacy between Dr. Morley and John Earle is another piece of corroborative evidence. During the exile, they lived one year together in the same house at Antwerp, and Morley preceded Earle as Bishop of Worcester (1660-62). Both being Oxford men, with only three years difference in age, the conclusion is at least a probable one that Earle not only knew Morley during the years when the latter guided Waller's literary studies at Beaconsfield, but that he was already at that time acquainted with the character and aims of Morley's rich but singular pupil.

assured that the poems 'are here to be found as [the author] first writ them.' In 1664 Waller was enjoying fame as the founder of a new school of poetry, and this fame he must have been anxious to increase, by freeing his poems from any earlier blemishes. The same year (1664) finds Dryden praising him as "the first that made writing easily an art; first showed us how to conclude the sense, most commonly in distichs." We should perhaps be unwarranted in doubting the truth of Waller's assertion without evidence, but it is interesting to note the extreme anxiety of Opitz under somewhat similar circumstances (1624),<sup>1</sup> and the haste with which, in the following year, he issued a new edition of his poems, in which the verses were made to conform to his new theory of accent, and of the regular alternation of arsis and thesis. Malherbe also, in France, assures his public in 1627, the year before his death, that

' Les puissantes faveurs dont Parnasse m'honore  
Non loin de mon berceau commencèrent leurs cours ;  
Je les possédais jeune, et les possède encore  
A la fin de mes jours.'<sup>2</sup>

So Waller told Aubrey that 'when he was a briske young sparke, and first studyed poetry, 'Methinks,' said he, 'I never sawe a good copie of English verses; they want smoothnesse; then I began to essay.'<sup>3</sup>

Lotheissen, *Geschichte der französischen Literatur im 17 Jahrhundert*, I (1877), adduces facts to prove that Malherbe, born in 1555, did not attain to his fine manner of writing before 1599, at the age of forty-four; and he attained it as Waller gained his mastery of English, by steady industry. From 1597 on, it is possible to trace Malherbe's closer and closer adherence to strict canons of form. Lotheissen mentions the existence of four anthologies in the period from 1597 to 1611, all containing poems by Malherbe. It is not probable that any early poems by Waller will turn up in the collections, but it must be acknowledged that at least a critical comparison of the printed editions of his poems is much to be desired. But such an examination cannot affect his permanent position among the literary artists of the new school. For that,

<sup>1</sup> The question whether Opitz originally authorized the Zingref edition of his poems, is still unsettled; cf. Braune's *Neudrucke*, Nr. 15 (Halle, 1879), S. vi; and Witkowski, *Martin Opitzens Aristarchus, und Buch von der deutschen Poeterei*, Leipzig, 1888, S. 36 f.

<sup>2</sup> Ode à Louis XIII partant pour la Rochelle.

<sup>3</sup> *Lives of Eminent Men*, II 563.

a broader basis of comparison is necessary, and this is to a great degree supplied in the works of Waller's elder contemporary, George Sandys.

Dryden, in the preface to his *Fables*, calls Sandys "the best versifier of the former age, if I may venture to call it by that name, which was the former part of this concluding century." The work of Sandys which elicited this high praise is his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, a book which has fallen into unmerited neglect. In 1872 the Rev. Richard Hooper published an excellent edition of Sandys' *Poetical Works* [*Paraphrases of the Psalms*, etc.]. In the introduction he gives much information as to the early editions of the '*Metamorphoses*.'<sup>1</sup> The earliest complete edition is that of 1626, but in Brydges' *Censura Literaria* (VI 132), Mr. Haslewood gives an account of an edition of 1621, containing the first five books, no copy of which has since been found. It is known that George Sandys went to Virginia in 1621,<sup>2</sup> as treasurer of the colony, and Stith, in his *History of Virginia*, Williamsburg, 1747, p. 303, under date of 1623, writes: "In the midst of these tumults and alarms the Muses were not silent. For at this time Mr. George Sandys, the Company's Treasurer of Virginia, made his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*."<sup>3</sup> In the poems of Michael Drayton (1627) a poetical epistle to Sandys in Virginia is published, which must have been written while the latter was in America:

"Go on with Ovid, as you have begun  
With the first five books; let your numbers run  
Glib as the former, so shall it live long,  
And do much honour to our English tongue."

It is therefore certain that Sandys, before 1623, and probably before his departure for Virginia in 1621, had published a translation of part of the *Metamorphoses*. That he continued correcting and improving the successive editions up to his death in 1638 is

<sup>1</sup> A complete bibliography of Sandys' *Metamorphoses* will be found in the *Dictionary of Books relating to America*, by Jos. Sabin, Parts 107-108. New York, 1889, p. 440.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hooper, p. xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> This statement is repeated in Justin Winsor's *Critical and Narrative History of America*, Vol. 3, by Robt. A. Brock, Boston, 1884, p. 145. Bancroft, *History*, Vol. I, 1883, p. 126, mentions Sandys in another connection, but apparently thinks it not worth mentioning that the first considerable literary work in America was done by Sandys in Virginia at this very early date.

certain; that of 1632 contains the following, in an Address to the Reader: "To the Translation I have given what perfection my Pen could bestow, by polishing, altering or restoring, the harsh, improper or mistaken, with a nicer exactness than perhaps is required in so long a labour."

It is, however, unlikely that the change in the handling of the couplet was great, or, in other words, that the number of unstopt lines will be found to be much greater in the earliest edition.<sup>1</sup> In 1626 Sandys was already forty-nine years old, and had in all probability essentially formed his style. In 1615 he had published in prose: 'A Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610. Foure Bookes. Containing a Description of the Turkish Empire, of Aegypt, of the Holy Land, and the Remote parts of Italy, and Islands adjoining.' This book has been praised by authors of his and our own day alike, as 'learned without pedantry, and circumstantial without being tedious.' We have it further, on the authority of Wood, that Sandys returned 'master of several languages.'

The circumstances of his journey are of interest for literature. Son of the Archbishop of York, educated at Oxford, left in easy circumstances, preceded to Paris by his elder brother, who had written a famous political tractate while there in 1599,<sup>2</sup> George Sandys begins his journey in 1610 as a scholar and gentleman of leisure, proceeding to the great centres of culture, and to the Holy Places. Of France he says: 'I began my journey through France hard upon the time when that execrable murther was committed upon the person of Henry IV by an obscure varlet.'

It is possible that we may never get nearer a solution of the mooted question of French influence upon English poetry just at that period than is presented in the case of Sandys. Malherbe, who introduced the 'classical' reform in French literature, who forbade *enjambement* in verse, had been for ten years an acknowledged authority in the French literary world, and had been since 1605 at the court, attached to the person of Henry IV, and setting

<sup>1</sup> There is no copy of the edition of 1626 in America, unless in some private library. The Lenox Library in New York possesses a copy of the edition of 1632, and a comparison of the first book in it with the same book in the folio of 1640 shows an almost exact agreement between them in the number of unstopt couplets.

<sup>2</sup> In his 'Discoveries' Ben Jonson mentions Sir Edwin Sandys with Sir Philip Sidney, and Richard Hooker, as excellent, 'either for judgment or style.' Works, p. 873.

the literary taste. To suppose that Sandys should not have become acquainted with the canons of French literature, and of Malherbe's reform, appears absurd.

It is not the object of any part of the present argument to attempt to prove that the gradual growth of the English heroic couplet in non-dramatic verse, from the epigrammatic and satirical style of Bishop Hall<sup>1</sup> and other writers about 1600 to its culmination at the end of the seventeenth century, was at any time violently disturbed by French influence. The English heroic couplet is a thoroughly national product, arrived at by a slow process of evolution. But, on the other hand, a sudden quickening of literary conscience in certain English writers, about the years 1616-26, as to the sin involved in the unstopt line, has never been explained, and it is not probable that any reasoning about the 'sober deliberativeness,' the introspection, the 'national quiet' which the new century brought in, will ever be able to explain it. At all events, it was Sandys, and not Waller, who at the beginning of the third decade of the century, first of all Englishmen, made a uniform practice of writing in heroic couplets which are on the whole in accord with the French rule, and which, for exactness of construction, and for harmonious versification, go far towards satisfying the demands of the later 'classical' school in England. The proof of this lies in a detailed comparison of Sandys' verse with that of Waller. The edition of Sandys' '*Metamorphosis Englished*' used for this purpose was the folio of 1640 (London, printed by J. L. for Andrew Hebb), a fine copy of which is in the library of the Peabody Institute in Baltimore.

On a basis of the first eighteen hundred lines in the works of each author, it was found that Sandys has 14 per cent of unstopt lines, Waller 23 per cent. For unstopt couplets the first book of the *Metamorphoses* (832 lines) was compared with the first 1025 lines (in couplets) in Fenton's edition of Waller. The percentage of unstopt couplets in Waller is 5.26, in Sandys 1.8 (one-third of the number in Waller). Sandys avoids an unstopt couplet, by introducing a parenthesis, 5 times, an average of .6 per cent; Waller 14 times, an average of 1.3 per cent (twice Sandys' average). Sandys has nine instances of feminine rhyme, Waller none.

<sup>1</sup> Schipper, *Englische Metrik*, II 206-8, marks in Bp. Hall the beginning of regularity in the use of the couplet, and finds in most of the following poets this regular epigrammatic character sustained.

These results are decisive as to the relation of Sandys to Waller. But it is also interesting to compare their use of the unstopt couplet with that of other poets. This it is now possible to do conveniently, as the necessary statistics have been compiled by Wm. Edw. Mead, in his dissertation, 'The Versification of Pope in its relation to the Seventeenth Century,' Leipzig, 1889. Adopting Mead's statistics of Pope's couplet, the result is as follows: In the avoidance of unstopt lines Sandys is found to be midway between Waller and Pope, the ratio being, Waller 23 per cent, Sandys 14.7, and Pope 6. In the unstopt couplet the ratio is a similar one. Waller has 5.26 per cent, Sandys 1.8, and Pope very few indeed. Mead has found six instances of unstopt couplet in the works of Pope, exclusive of the translations.

The importance of these figures is obvious. However much we may be influenced in favor of Waller by the smoothness and easy flow of his verse, certainly no modern critic has maintained that these characteristics, subjectively considered, offer a practical basis for any doctrine in poetics. No one has yet set up any precise and special test for the 'classical' verse for the period culminating in Pope, except the avoidance of unstopt couplets. This also is the sole claim that has been allowed in France to Malherbe. According to this test, therefore, it was Sandys, the predecessor of Waller by several years, who first set the type of composition for the new school, and whose technical execution is more correct than that of any English writer up to Dryden and Pope.

It now remains to produce direct evidence that Sandys, while possessing a less happy poetical instinct than Waller, was more conscious of the new rule, and was, in his earlier work, more conscientious in following it. It is notorious that Waller's first couplets do not differ in execution from his last. But a careful examination of the whole of Sandys' *Metamorphoses* reveals the fact that there is from first to last a gradual increase in the number of unstopt lines and couplets:

		Unstopt Lines.	Unstopt Couplets.
B. I	832 lines,	14 per cent,	1.8 per cent.
II,	966 "	16.5 "	3 "
III,	820 "	16 "	3 "
IV,	906 "	17.6 "	3.4 "
V,	774 "	24 "	5.8 "
VI,	770 "	20 "	6 "
VII,	932 "	23 "	7.7 "

	Unstopt Lines.	Unstopt Couplets.
VIII, 984 lines,	25.5 per cent,	6 per cent,
IX, 732 "	28 "	9.7 "
X, 820 "	28.5 "	8.4 "
XI, 836 "	33.9 "	11 "
XII, 674 "	33 "	10.8 "
XIII, 1092 "	28 "	8.5 "
XIV, 928 "	30 "	10.8 "
XV, 936 "	29 "	10.4 "

This represents a gradual increase of more than one hundred per cent in the number of unstopt lines, and of nearly six hundred per cent of unstopt couplets.

Sandys' translation of the first book of Virgil's *Aeneid*, which appears in the edition of 1640, exhibits 32 per cent of unstopt lines, of which 10 per cent mark unstopt couplets. Appended to the translation is the following expressive motto: '*Splendidis longum valedico nugis.*' It is plain that this was the last of his translations. It is impossible that the small number of unstopt couplets and lines in the first books of the *Metamorphoses* should be the result of later correction on the part of Sandys, for in that case the translation of Virgil would exhibit a similar percentage. The first books of the *Metamorphoses* represent his first literary work, when fresh from theoretical studies of poetics. In the later books, led by his own sound poetic instinct, he gradually frees himself from the unnatural bondage of invariably stopt couplets.

Saintsbury (*History of Eliz. Lit.*, 1887, p. 454) says of English verse in the period of James I, that "a certain improvement in general technical execution testifies to longer practice." Theorists were not then, nor had not been, lacking, but just at the threshold of the new age there are two poets, very different in rank, who accompany the exercise of their art by curious studies, interesting for the history of the couplet. They are Sir John Beaumont and Drummond of Hawthornden. The first of these need not detain us long. In verses, which must have been written before 1625, he lauds King James as the real author of a reform in poetry. James had published his '*Essays of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie*' in 1585, four years before the publication of Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie*; but it is not probable that it had ever exercised influence in England. Beaumont, while praising the king, has his eye upon influences from abroad. The verses are

interesting, as giving one of the first contemporary descriptions of the purely reflective couplet:<sup>1</sup>

'Forgive my boldnesse, that I here present  
The life of Muses yielding true consent  
In ponder'd numbers, which with ease I try'd,  
When your judicious rules have been my guide.

In ev'ry language now in Europe spoke  
By nations which the Roman empire broke,  
The relish of the Muse consists in rime,  
One verse must meete another like a chime.

In many changes these may be exprest,  
But those that joyne most simply run the best  
[i. e. heroic couplet]:  
Their form surpassing far the fetter'd staves  
[i. e. stanzas],  
Vaine care, and needless repetition saves.'

In a set of verses which must have been written in the period between James' death (1625) and his own (1627),<sup>2</sup> he indicates the progress of the reform in England:

'He leads the lawless poets of our times  
To smother cadence, to exacter rimes:  
He knew it was the proper work of kings,  
To keep proportion, ev'n in smallest things.'<sup>3</sup>

Drummond of Hawthornden, born 1585, is a poet of far wider range. Though a Scot, he wrote pure and 'softly sliding' English verses. Drummond was probably a closer student of foreign poetry than any other man in Great Britain. He was in France throughout the years 1607-8. By 1611 he had gathered together at his pleasant country-seat one hundred and twenty French books. In 1609 he entered in his note-book the following works of Ronsard as having been read during that year: *La Franciade*, *Amours*, *Hymnes*, *Odes*, *Elegies et Eclogues*.<sup>4</sup> In 1619 occurred the famous conversations with Ben Jonson, who was his guest at Hawthornden. Drummond informs us that Jonson praised his

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Chalmers' *English Poets* (1810), Vol. 6, p. 30. The edition of Beaumont's *Poems*, by Rev. A. B. Grosart, in Fuller Worthies Library, was not accessible.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, where the received date, 1628, is shown to be an error.

<sup>3</sup> 'To the Glorious Memory of our Late Sovereign Lord, King James.'

<sup>4</sup> D. Laing, *Archaeologia Scotica*, Vol. IV (1857), p. 74.

Epitaph on Prince Henry, 'save that his verses smelled too much of the schools,' and that he 'wished, to please the king, that the piece 'Forth Feasting' had been his own.'<sup>1</sup> In the first of the pieces mentioned, *Tears on the Death of Moeliades* (196 lines), published in 1613, there are eighteen per cent of unstopt lines, representing five per cent of unstopt couplets. But in 'Forth Feasting' (408 lines), published in 1617, there are only seven per cent of unstopt lines, and not a single unstopt couplet. In the *Elegy on the Victorious King of Sweden, Gustavus Adolphus* (1632), and in other later pieces, there is a very large number of unstopt couplets.<sup>2</sup>

It is evident that the history of Drummond's verse is similar to that of Sandys'. Returning home from his two years' stay in France, he continues his poetical studies, and produces verse which in the main comes up to even fastidious demands of the new canons then forming. But in the poems of his later years, the strenuous rule is more and more neglected, and a vigorous, harmonious couplet is produced, which is remarkably modern in type.

These two British poets, who were perhaps the most studious and critical of their time, are the very ones who may have come most directly under the influence of the literary movement abroad, especially in France.<sup>3</sup> It is they also, who, on returning, wrote the most correct verses; which were, however, less graceful and melodious than those of Waller. It would be idle to go further, and to assert foreign influence in a case where direct proof is not forthcoming, but the coincidence is remarkable.

Waller's verses are not only more graceful and melodious than those of the writers we have been considering; they are also

<sup>1</sup> D. Laing, *Archaeologia Scotica*, Vol. IV (1857), pp. 247-8.

<sup>2</sup> Drummond's Works, Edinburgh, 1711.

<sup>3</sup> It may be objected that Michael Drayton's *Heroical Epistles* (1597) are comparatively free from unstopt couplets. But, aside from the fact that Drayton did not habitually write in this metre, his style is purely Elizabethan, and lacking in every requirement of the reformed poetry: in classical allusion, varying caesura, fixed accent; in short, in 'the strong lines that catch the times.' His metre is as far from the comparative 'classicism' of Drummond, as is that of William Browne, though the *Britannia's Pastorals* contain a larger proportion of 'free' lines.

<sup>4</sup> Drummond was thoroughly acquainted with Italian poetry also. This is attested by his sonnets, and by the memoranda of books read.

smoother and have a richer cadence. These constantly recurring words, smoothness, polish, sweetness, in contemporary references,<sup>1</sup> call for a definition. Such, if possible at all, cannot be attempted here; it would be the starting point for a new inquiry. But for such an inquiry the descriptions of the couplet, hitherto in vogue, are insufficient. The older definitions are too vague, and we have seen that the more definite one suggested by Dryden and made more stringent by Gosse, fails to describe the verse adequately. Any new definition of the 'classical' heroic couplet must have something to say of the rhythm and harmony of the verse.<sup>2</sup>

In parting with a writer like Waller, who tried above all things to make himself agreeable to his own age, and who succeeded so well that both it and the whole century following made English poetry really begin with him, and found only music and grace and delight in his verses, there is one thing to regret. It is that any attack whatever upon his position and pretensions as a poet should come at a time when the tide of popular favor is setting so strongly against the kind of poetry in which he excelled. The historic office of that poetry in chastening a too exuberant literary style is in danger of being overlooked. It is even to be feared that the beauty of the cadences of the verse, unequalled within a certain range, is no longer fully appreciated. A permanent modest niche for Waller in our pantheon is more to be desired than the alternate worship and neglect which have been his portion. Waller, like the youth in Wordsworth's poem, was attended on his way by a 'vision splendid,' by the vanishing glory of the literature of

<sup>1</sup> 'The easy vigor of a line  
Where Denham's strength and Waller's sweetness join.'  
Pope, *Essay on Criticism*, l. 360.

'Waller was smooth, but Dryden taught to join  
The varying verse, the full resounding line,  
The long-majestic march, the energy divine.'  
Pope, *Epistles*, Book II, l. 267.

'Well might that charmer [Carew] his fair Caelia crowne,  
And that more polisht Tyterus [Waller] renowne  
His Sacarissa.'  
Lines prefixed to Lovelace's *Lucasta* (1649).

<sup>2</sup> The articles by Professor Sievers, in Paul und Braune's *Beiträge* X und XII, on *Die Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses*, may suggest the beginning of a solution of this problem. The doctrine of 'rhythmical series' within the line has already been applied in an interesting way to Shakespeare's verse [*Othello*] by Professor T. R. Price, New York, 1888.

the age just past, while with Pope it had faded to the light of common day. In Waller's songs and verses there are traces of that evanescent grace and softness, but not of the strength; for his poetry is feminine. But his art is able to teach, both by what it accomplished and by what it vaguely suggests.

Sainte Beuve, in his *Nouveaux Lundis* [Vol. 13 (1870), p. 360], writing in the days of Victor Hugo and Alfred de Musset, sets down with buoyant optimism: 'Malherbe débuta par une disposition, par une inspiration en quelque sorte négative, par le mépris de ce qui avait précédé chez nous en poésie.' Malherbe, the negative inspiration of French literature! How the phrase would have tickled Waller! As applied to himself, and as a tribute to his after-fame, it would almost have consoled him for the lack, in more modern editions of his works, of the proud motto that frowns upon us from the pages of Fenton's gorgeous quarto: 'Cujus gloriæ neque profuit quisquam laudando, nec vituperando quisquam nocuit.'

HENRY WOOD.

#### IV.—A DESCRIPTION OF STUDENT LIFE AT PARIS IN THE TWELFTH CENTURY.

Among the many voluminous didactic poems of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, one of the most voluminous is the "Archithrenius,"<sup>1</sup> a moral epic in nine cantos, written in 1184 by the Cistercian monk, Johannes de Anville or Hauteville. The hero, whose sentimental character is sufficiently indicated by his name, Archweeper, is represented as being dissatisfied with the world and himself. To find relief from his anxieties and doubts, he undertakes a pilgrimage; not, as one might expect, to Jerusalem, but to Nature's holy temple. The many adventures which he undergoes on his way to this imaginary sanctuary form the bulk of the poem. We see him jogging along over mountains and deserts, through lonely forests and populous cities; we see him in the "house of Venus" barely escape the temptations of the flesh, in the "tavern of Bacchus" almost lose himself in wild dissipations. We see him on the "Mount of Ambition," on the "Hill of Presumption"; we see him on the island of Thule listening to moral speeches of Greek and Roman philosophers; we see him finally in the "Garden of Nature," full of faith in the harmony of the universe, and comforted by the presence of a beautiful maiden, called Moderantia, whom the goddess Nature herself introduces to him as his bride.

The poem is remarkable as one of the earliest specimens of allegorical poetry in modern Europe; and as a forerunner of the "Roman de la Rose," of "Teuerdank," and of the "Pilgrim's Progress," it deserves a more careful attention than the histories of literature have hitherto given to it.<sup>2</sup> But its most remarkable part is a strikingly realistic description of student life in Paris, which forms one of the episodes of the hero's life, and which stands in a most curious contrast with the indistinctness and unreality of the rest of the poem. The picture which the author gives us of the daily work and habits of the Parisian student of the twelfth century is far from being pleasant. Paris itself, to be

<sup>1</sup> Thus, instead of Archithrenius, the MSS.

<sup>2</sup> Gaston Paris, in "La Littérature Française au Moyen Âge," does not even mention its name.

sure, seems to have possessed even at that time a charm of its own. It is called "altera regia Phoebi," "mundi rosa," "balsamus orbis"; and its beautiful surroundings, its fertile vineyards, its good-natured population, are highly extolled. But alas! the poor scholastic derives no benefit from all these attractions. His life is wasted in fruitless plodding and incessant abnegation. His dress is shabby and antiquated, his meals consist of peas, beans and cabbage, next to no care is taken of his room, his bed is a hard mattress lying close on the floor. So he lives day in day out, the true picture of a "grind," and even at night his studies pursue him; for he suffers greatly from insomnia.

The first complete edition of this work appeared at Paris, 1517, aedibus Ascensianis, which is now very rare. Th. Wright, in his "Anglo Latin Satirical Poets of the Twelfth Century," Vol. I, London, 1872, gave a second edition of the poem, based on MSS from the British Museum. I have compared the following manuscripts:

Cod. A, Rome, Vatic. Reg. 1554, fol. 109-166, saec. XIII.

Cod. B, Berne, City Libr. 683, fol. 93, saec. XIII.

Cod. C, Perugia, City Libr. 15548, saec. XIII.

Cod. D, Rome, Vatic. Reg. 370, fol. 189-214, saec. XIV.

Cod. E, Rome, Vatic. Reg. 1812, saec. XV.

From these manuscripts some extracts were published by myself in Vol. XX of the "Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte," p. 475-502, together with an analysis of the whole poem. Here I offer those passages relating to the scholastic life in the Paris of the twelfth century. Those desirous of further information about the poem and its author I would refer to my article just mentioned; to the *Histoire littéraire* XIV, p. 569-579; the *Biographie universelle* s. v. Jean de Hautville; Wright, *Biogr. Brit. Lit.* II, 250; and J. Simler, *De archithrenio duodecimi saeculi carmine*, Parisiis, 1871.

*De miseria scolarium.*

- 1 At<sup>1</sup> diis paulo minor plebes Phoebea<sup>2</sup> secundos  
Vix metit eventus; quicquid serat, undique tortis  
Vapulat adversis. Gemit Architrenius agmen  
Palladis a miseris vix respirare, beatos

<sup>1</sup> The miserable life of the scholastics is contrasted with the preceding description of the delights of Paris life in general.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sil. Ital. 8, 271 Martia plebes.

- 5 Pectore philosophos, fato pulsante, flagello  
 Asperiore premi, nulla virtute favori  
 Divitis adnecti, studio sudante <sup>1</sup> malorum  
 Continuare dies, senium, prohibentibus annis,  
 Praecipitare malis pubisque urgere senectae  
 10 Damna, rudimentis dum vitae abrumpit egestas  
 Gaudia, <sup>2</sup> dum tenuem victum fortuna ministrat,  
 Ad modicum torpente manu. <sup>3</sup> Ruit omnis in illos  
 Omnibus adversis, vacui furit aspera ventris  
 Incola, longa fames; formae populatur honorem  
 15 Exhaustitque genas macies pallore; remittit  
 Quam dederat natura nivem, ferrugine texit  
 Liventes oculos, facula splendoris adustam  
 Exstinguit faciem <sup>4</sup>; marcent excussa genarum  
 Lilia laborumque rosae; collique pruina <sup>5</sup>  
 20 Deicitur livore luti; maestissima vultu  
 Mortis imago sedet; neglecto pectinis usu  
 Caesaries surgit, confusio crinis in altum  
 Devia turbat iter, digito non tersa colenti  
 Pulverulenta riget, secum luctamine crinis  
 25 Dimicat alterno; non haec discordia paci  
 Redditur, intortum digito solvente capillum. <sup>6</sup>

*De tenuitate vestitus.*

- Quem scopulum mentis, scopulo quid durius illa  
 Horrida non flectat logicorum turba? Rigorem  
 Quis non excutiat et toto pectore dulces  
 30 Derivet lacrimas, quotiens occurrit honesta  
 Philosophi fortuna minor? Defringitur aevo  
 Qua latitat vestis; aetatis fimbria longae  
 Est, non artificis; ipsa est quae abrumpit amictum  
 Portandique labor quodque omnibus unus adesse

<sup>1</sup> B, suadente.

<sup>2</sup> I. e. old age overtakes them before they have had an opportunity to enjoy their youth (rudimenta vitae).

<sup>3</sup> I. e. fortune is slow to grant even a moderate livelihood.

<sup>4</sup> Nature takes back the snow (transparency of skin) which she had given, she covers with dimness the leaden colored eyes, she puts out the face that had been lit up with the touch of brilliancy.

<sup>5</sup> I. e. whiteness.

<sup>6</sup> A similar picture of scholastic slovenliness is afforded by the description of Aristoteles' appearance in Walter of Chatillon's *Alexandreis* I, 59 sqq.

- 35 Cogitur obsequiis, varios damnatus ad usus.  
 Respirasse dies nullo sudore meretur,  
 Quem dederint noctes venti suspirat ad ictus.  
 Litigat ad Boreae flatus, adsibilat Euris  
 Mollihus et Zephyri clementes ridet ad auras.<sup>1</sup>

*De indigentia rerum familiarium et cibi maxime.*

- 40 Parva domus; res ipsa minor. Contraxit utrumque  
 Immensus tractusque diu sub Pallade fervor  
 Et logices jucundus amor tenuisque laboris  
 Emeriti merces et quae de more sophistas  
 (Miror qua invidia fati) comitatur, egestas.  
 45 Pauperies est tota domus, desuevit<sup>2</sup> ad illos  
 Ubertas venisse lares, nec visitat aegrum  
 Copia Parnassum, sublimior advolat aulas,  
 His ignota casis, ubi pauca annosa supellex.  
 Languida sordet anus, admoto murmurat igni  
 50 Urceolus, quo pisa natant, quo caepe vagatur,  
 Quo faba, quo porrus capiti tormenta minantur,  
 Quo rigidum pallescit olus, quo fercula festo  
 Atriplices<sup>3</sup> libanda die, quo vilior horti  
 Jejuna expectat quaevis farrago Minervam.  
 55 Hic undae assiduo conflictu litigat unda,  
 Hic coxisse dapes est condivisse; libido  
 Mensae nulla venit, nisi quod sale sparsa rigorem  
 Esca parum flectit; solo fit amicior usu  
 Coenula, luctanti minus obluctata palato.

*De vilitate servientium.*

- 60 Nudus in annoso tunicae squalore ministrat  
 Geta<sup>4</sup> dapes, dum vile meri libamen<sup>5</sup> in urbe  
 Birria<sup>5</sup> venatur, pretio vestitus eodem  
 Muricis ejusdem, luteus, macer, horridus, ore  
 Languidus exsangui, plumarum squameus hirtam  
 65 Agmine caesariem, festucae exstantis in altum  
 Cuspide cristatus. Crinis silva intima denso

<sup>1</sup> I. e. the same garment is worn for any kind of work, day and night, and at all seasons.

<sup>2</sup> B, desuescit.

<sup>3</sup> B, et triplici.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Terent. Adelph. III 1 passim.

<sup>5</sup> A, Butria; B, C, Birria; E, Biria; cf. Ducange s. v.

Pulvere pressa jacet, sed et his pejora latere  
 Suspitor, attritum digito scrutante capillum,  
 Nescio quid facilem dum saepe adducit ad unguem.

*De cubilibus.*

- 70 Sobria post mensae tenuis convivia frenum  
 Suscipiente gula, satiem quod praevenit ante  
 Dimidiasse famem, scabra farragine<sup>1</sup> strati  
 Contrahitur macies, quo vix<sup>2</sup> depressior infra  
 Area descendit, ut terrea paene jacentem
- 75 Proxima frangat humus. Illic pugil improbus<sup>3</sup> heres  
 Sudat Aristotelis, oculum mordente lucerna,  
 Dum pallens studio et marcens oleo ardet, utroque  
 Languidus, insomnis et oculo et pectore noctes  
 Extrahit alterutro vigiles, oculusque lucernae
- 80 Pervigil et lippit et lippum torquet ocellum.

*De nocturno studio.*

- Imprimit ergo libris oculi mentisque lucernam  
 Et libro et cubito, dextraeque innixus et auri  
 Quod nova quod veterum peperit cautela<sup>4</sup> revolvit;  
 Omnia, Castaliis pede quae sudaverat<sup>5</sup> antris
- 85 Pegasus, exhaurit oculis et mente fluentia,  
 Nunc oculo nunc mente bibens, nunc haurit utroque,  
 Illo plus illaque minus, nunc lecta camino  
 Decoquit ingenii memorique in pectore nodo  
 Pressius astringit, nunc delibata reducto
- 90 Praeterit affectu.

*De sopore scholaris studio fatigati.*

- Talibus insudans olei librique lucerna,  
 Tabidus illanguet, toti nupsisse Minervae  
 Sedulus ardet amor, dum strato Phoebus ab axe  
 Antipodum surgat et paucis distet ab ortu
- 95 Jam gradibus. Tenui tum primum spargit ocellös  
 Nube quies somni calamumque et caetera laxis

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Asc. ferrugine.

<sup>2</sup> B, quovis.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Verg. Georg. 1, 145 labor improbus.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Ducange s. v.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Pers. 5, 149 nummi pergant . . . avidos sudare deunces.

- Instrumenta rapit digitis, declive libello  
 Suscipiente caput. Sed in illa pace soporis  
 Pacis eget studii labor insopitus, et ipso  
 100 Cura vigil<sup>1</sup> somno, libros operamque ministrat  
 Excitae somnus animae, nec prima sopori  
 Anxietas cedit, sed quae vigilaverat ante  
 Sollicitudo redit, et major summa laboris  
 Curarum studiis insomnibus obicit Hydram.  
 105 Sic varia pectus ambage insomnia vexant  
 Sollicitumque trahit curarum turba, soporis  
 Indepasta fame. Iam jamque Aurora diei  
 Nuntiat adventum, cum Phoebō praevis ortum  
 Lucifer explorat primumque excerpere rorem  
 110 Mane novo sudante parat, ne semita Phoebi  
 Polluat uda togam chlamydisque elidat honorem.

*De properatione ejusdem, ad studium profecturi.*

- Ecce sopor Phoebō vigili cessurus ocellis  
 Philosophi cedit, somno nutantibus<sup>2</sup> astris.  
 Iam vigilante die stellis citus insilit hospes  
 115 Hospite mutato. Miser ecce excitur ocellus,  
 Luciferi clamante tuba, damnoque lucerna  
 Ardet adhuc, exstincta die caelique sepulta  
 Lumine, non oleo summam aspergente papyrum  
 Obsequiove manus vasi revocantis olivum,  
 120 Post alios pastus se depascente papyro.  
 Excutit ergo caput vultuque assurgit et ore  
 Turbidus, et crinis digitorum verrit apertam  
 Pectine caesariem, somnoque madentia siccant  
 Summa labella sinu, noctisque laboribus ore  
 125 Respirante gemit, oculosque in faece natantes  
 Expediit a nodis ciliū textentibus umbram  
 Extricatque manu; partesque effusus in omnes  
 Undique discurrit oculus, dum tempore digna  
 Nomina deprenhat; et ubi dinovit ad ortum  
 130 Surgere solis equos, queritur dispendia somni  
 Plus justo traxisse moras nimiumque citato  
 Axe diem raptam, praecessurusque magistrum

<sup>1</sup> B, jugis.

<sup>2</sup> A, micantibus; Ed. Asc., invitantibus.

- Praecessisse timet, et jam pro parte diurna  
 Intonuisse tuba fontisque fecunda propinet<sup>1</sup>  
 135 Pocula Cirrhaei. Domitos torporibus artus  
 Increpat, et maestos irae indignatio risus  
 Excutit et tumidos flammato pectore questus  
 Evomit, in lacrimas tandem vergente querela.

*De statu ejusdem in magistri praesentia.*

- Ut ventum est Pallas ubi mitior agmina Cirrhae<sup>2</sup>  
 140 Armat et ad studii mens sudatura palaestram  
 Suscitatur ingenii flammam, conamina mentis  
 Contrahit, exacuit animam totusque coacti  
 Pectoris incumbit oculis riguaque magistrum  
 Aure et mente bibit et verba cadentia promo  
 145 Promptus utroque levat, oculique et mentis in illo  
 Fixa vigilque manet acies aurisque maritat  
 Pronuba dilectam cupida cum mente Minervam.  
 Hanc sitit, hanc ardet studii Venus altera, major  
 Alter anhelat Amor; totumque impendit acumen,  
 150 Expenditque diem, dum Phoebi roscidus orbis  
 Crescit in occasum, sublataque redditur astris  
 Flamma suusque dies, cum limina sole fugato  
 Et noctis reserat et lucis vespera claudit.

KUNO FRANCKE.

<sup>1</sup> This distorted construction in all the MSS and Ed. Asc.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Claud. praef. 2 Rap. Pros. 16. Cirrhaeae artes.

## NOTES.

### AVESTA CONTRIBUTIONS.

#### 1.—Avesta *unāhva*, *raēšaya*, Vd. 17. 2.

The Avesta rites to be observed in connection with cutting the hair and paring the nails are given in the familiar 17th Fargard of the Vendidad. At Vd. 17. 2, inquiry is made as to who it is that by his deeds offers sacrifice, as it were, to the demon of destruction. The reply, literally rendered, reads: 'It is such a one (as those) who (*yō* = here pl. as often in the Vd.) in this material life comb the hair or shave the hair or pare the nails and let it lie (*dim upa.taošayeinti*, i. e. leave the cuttings) in *unāhva* and in *raēšaya*'.

The last words *apa dim upa.taošayeinti unāhva dim raēšaya* are variously rendered by the Avesta translators.<sup>1</sup> Spiegel, Uebersetzung, ad loc., gives 'wenn sie sich scheeren (*taošayeinti*) an den Locken (?) oder am Barte'.—Justi, Handbuch, s. v. follows Spiegel.—De Harlez, Av. trad. ad loc., 'et qu'on en fait tomber les débris dans les maisons pour le malheur (des hommes)'. With *unā-*, de Harlez in the note ad loc. compares Skt. *vana* 'demeure', and makes *raēšaya* an 'instrumental désignant le terme'.—Darmesteter, S. B. E. iv. Zend Avesta, p. 186, renders the words 'drops them in a hole or in a crack', but adds in the foot-note "doubtful".

Darmesteter's translation, however, in spite of his "doubtful", I believe, is perfectly correct. It agrees apparently also with the traditional rendering of Aspendiārji—see Spiegel, Commentar ueber das Avesta, i. p. 371. We need only support it by finding the etymology. The two words *unāhva*, *raēšaya*, are of course both locatives. The following explanation I would suggest:

(1) *unāhva* 'in holes, crevices, crannies' is loc. pl. fem., stem *unā-* from adj. *ūna-* 'lacking, empty, wanting, deficient' = Skt. *ūna-*. The same *unā-* also as substantive fem. occurs at Ys. 10. 15 *unam* in the sense of an 'empty niggardly (dish)'

<sup>1</sup> The Pahlavi version is treated by Paul Horn in Z. D. M. G. xliii. p. 32 seq.

which Hoama rejects—see Geldner, K. Z. xxviii. p. 185. The word in its adj. form is found contrasted with *pərəna-* 'full, plenty' at Vd. 22. 18 *yā ūnəm pərənəm kərənaoti* '(the blessing) which changes want into plenty'. Two new passages as instances of the adj. use of *ūna-* may now be added; they are from Haug, Zand-Pahlavi Glossary, pp. 63. 20; 64. 3. Furthermore, for a verb kindred see *vanaite* 'may be wanting' Z. Phil. Gloss. p. 62. 9. The adj. *ūna-* (the subst. *ūnā-* likewise), then, comes from  $\sqrt{ū}$ - 'to be wanting', cf. *uyamna* Vsp. 15. 1 (see the present writer in A. O. S. Proceedings, October, 1888). Cf. Skt. *ūnd-*, Gk. *εἴνυς* 'empty, bereft', A. S. *wan-ian*, Eng. *wan-ting*. The development of the meaning of the noun from the adjective is easy: the substantive *ūnā-* f. denotes an empty place whether pot or hole—'a cavity', cf. Lat. *cavum* 'hole', i. e. Lat. *cavus*: *plenus* (e. g. Lucret. 6. 1085) :: Av. *ūna-*: *pərəna-* (e. g. Vd. 22. 5, cf. Ys. 10. 15).

(2) *raēšaya* 'in a crack' is loc. sg. (i. e. + *raēše* postpos. a) from none other than the ordinary word *raēša-* (e. g. Vd. 7. 38, 13. 31, etc.), from  $\sqrt{riš}$ - 'to split, wound, tear'. That is, *raēšā-* m. (1) 'a wound'.—(2) 'a crack, split' (perh. the more orig. meaning of  $\sqrt{riš}$ -, cf. Germ. *riss*), i. e. a crack or fissure in the wall or floor,—cf. Eng. 'gaping wounds' and *gap* 'a breach, opening'. Thus *upa.taošayeinti* denotes 'let the hair lie in holes, crannies (or possibly old 'pots' cf. Ys. 10. 15) or in a crack'. The word 2 *raēša-* in Justi, Handbuch, therefore should be dropped, and the reference placed as meaning (2) under the familiar *raēša-*.

The injunction, therefore, given against leaving the hair or nails in crevices or cracks is particularly apt; it is there, according to the Avesta, Vd. 17. 3, that vermin (*hrafstra*) and lice (*spiš*) will congregate. The hair and nail cuttings should be duly deposited in a hole (*magəm* Vd. 17. 5, 7) properly prepared for them with fitting spells and there buried in ceremonious manner. In illustration of the superstition, it may be added that even now among the Feejee Islanders, 'most natives, on cutting their hair, hide what is cut off in the thatch of their own house'—see Lubbock, Origin of Civilization, pp. 166–170. For similar parallels see A. O. S. Proceedings, October, 1885.

## 2.—Av. *zafan-*, *zafar-*, *prizafan-*.

Instances of Av. *f* = orig. *pv* have been given by the present writer in A. J. P., x. p. 86. To these as another example may be

added, Av. *zafan-*, *zafar-* 'jaw'. The derivation is clearly \**zapvan-*, \**zapvar-* from  $\sqrt{zab}$  = Skt.  $\sqrt{jabh}$  'to grind, crush'—suffix *-van*, *-var* (*v*-voiceless) as in *karšvan-*, *karšvar-*, *urupwān-*, *urupwar-*.

In this connection the nom. sg. *prizafā* 'triple-jawed' Yt. 5. 29, 19. 47, becomes interesting. It is from a *van*-stem adjective—cf. voc. sg. *prizafem*, acc. sg. *prizafanem*—with *s*-nom. (orig. *-ās*) like *taurvā* 'conquering', cf. also *advā* 'way'.

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, March 3, 1890.

#### NASALIS SONANS = $\ddot{u}$ IN THE AVESTA.

In the Iranian languages, instances of the *r*-vowel expressed by simple *u* are found—see Hübschmann, K. Z. xxvii. 112. The same is true likewise of the syllabic *l* = *u* in Skt. *ulōkā* (from *llkōkā*, Bartholomae, Studien zur indogerm. Sprachgeschichte, i. p. 123). The examples may be multiplied. I would here draw attention to a few cases in which the vocalic *n* is represented by *u* (written also  $\ddot{u}$ ) in the Avesta.

(1) Av. *puḥša-* 'fifth' from \**pnk<sub>2</sub>htha-*,—i. e. *pnk<sub>2</sub>* weak form of \**pank-*, *pañc-*. The Old Pers., like the Skt., must have had \**pancama-*, as the New Pers.  $\text{پنج}$  *panj* shows. Hence it seems that von Fierlinger's views K. Z. xxvii. 193 are not all that may be said in regard to this word.

(2) Av. *-šūta-* (= *šuta-*) from *k<sub>1</sub>sntā-* (cf. Skt. *kṣatā-* from  $\sqrt{kṣan-}$ ) in *anapišūta-* 'uninjured, unabridged', Ys. 19. 5 (bis), Vsp. 15. 2, and in *aipišūta-* Ys. 19. 5; again in *arəzō-šūta-* 'wounded in battle' Yt. 10. 36. All these forms I would prefer to withdraw from  $\sqrt{śu-}$  (\**śyu-*) = Skt.  $\sqrt{cyu-}$ , and connect rather with Skt.  $\sqrt{kṣan-}$ . This seems to make their significance clearer. Perhaps here belongs also Av. *vātō-šūta-*, Ys. 9. 32 '(cloud) torn by the wind'. I would then connect  $\sqrt{kṣan-}$  with  $\kappa\rho\epsilon\iota\nu\omega$ , and not—as Benfey, Wurzelwörterbuch, i. p. 181, and Bartholomae, Arische Forschungen, ii. p. 56, with  $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , *agžəonvamnəm*.

(3) Av. *vayō-tūte* Vd. 13. 8 from *tntā-* (cf. Skt. *tatā-* from  $\sqrt{tan-}$ ); thus *vayō-tuta-* 'storm-bound, sturmverhüllt' cf. PWb. *tatā-* s. v.  $\sqrt{tan-}$ . This explanation of the word heightens the picture in the Vd. passage. Geldner's translation (Drei Yasht, p. 52, *tūte* as

verb) seems to me doubtful; a verb is hardly wanting in the sentence. The New Pers. *تاداه* *tadah* 'web' (cf. also PWb. s. v. *4√tan-*) shows that the Old Pers., like the Skt., must have had *tatd-*.

(4) Av. *hūitiš* Ys. 19. 17 from *\*hntiš* 'earning, meriting' to *√han-* = Skt. *√san-* + suffix *-ti* forming here nomen agentis, cf. Lindner, *Altindische Nominalbildung*, p. 76. Geldner (*Drei Yasht*, p. 130) translates it 'Gesinde'. In the new edition of the texts, Ys. 19. 17, he connects *hūitiš* with the phrase *vāstryō fšuyqs*.

(5) Av. *kusra-* to *kas-u-* (stem *kas-* in *kasō-tafōdra-*, otherwise *kns*, as in *kasu-* and derivatives) for *knsrd-*?

(6) Av. *gufra-*; *gufya-* (variant to *gafya-* Yt. 15. 28) from *\*gmfra-*, *gmfyā-*?

(7) Av. *buna-* from *\*bndhna-*, as *sana-* from *\*sadna* or *\*sndna-*, with loss of *d*?

I may eventually perhaps add other examples for the representation of the *n*-vowel by *u* in the Avesta. Suffice it for the present thus briefly to have hinted at some instances.

PAUL HORN.

STRASSBURG, Germany.

#### PROVERBS IN SERVIUS.

To the collections of Otto which have appeared from time to time in *Archiv f. Latein. Lex.*, I would add some examples of proverbs noted in the Commentary of Servius.

Arch. III 217—Die Götter und Halbgötter im Sprichworte—an apparent reference to Proteus in A. XII 891 *Verte omnis tete in facies*: (Serv.) *et est proverbialiter dictum*.

Arch. III 392—Zu den Tiersprichwörtern—B. VII 51 f.

Hic tantum Boreae curamus frigora, quantum  
Aut numerum lupus aut torrentia flumina ripas:

*et totum proverbialiter dictum est.*

Arch. IV 26—Die Natur im Sprichwort—A. XI 405

Amnis et Hadriacas retro fugit Aufidus undas:

(Serv. ad 403) et utitur Graeco proverbio *ἄνα ποταμῶν*: sic Horatius (Epod. 16, 28) et ante Padus Matina laverit cacumina; compare B. VII 52 above.

Arch. VI 333 — Der menschliche Körper und seine Teile im Sprichwort—A. IX 276 Iam pectore toto Accipio:

(Serv. ad 274) *et est de proverbio: Cicero de legibus* (I 18, 49), *nisi toto pectore amatur, ut dicitur: cum enim dicit 'ut dicitur' ostendit proverbiale.*

Arch. VI 328; cf. Serv. ad Geor. II 277 In unguem: ad perfectionem. et est translatio a marmorariis, qui iuncturas marmorum unguibus probant: Horatius (Sat. I 5, 32).

I have noted also the following additional examples:

A. IV 190 Facta atque infecta: *et est quasi proverbiale: nam hoc est 'tam ficti praviqve tenax, quam nuntia veri.'*

A. XII 811 Digna indigna pati: i. e. omnia. et proverbialiter dictum est.

A. X 547 Dixerat ille aliquid magnum: proverbialiter dictum est, ac si diceret, non mirum sic occisum esse eum qui sibi plurimum adrogabat.

LEVERETT MOORE.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A Commentary on Catullus. By ROBINSON ELLIS, M. A., LL. D. Second edition. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1889.

In his preface Mr. Ellis states that this "edition differs from the former, as in other points, so particularly in recalling the attention of scholars to the earliest period of Catullian criticism, the latter half of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century." He claims that these scholars had a nicer perception of language, and a more delicate feeling for what was probable in metre, than the later generations. Only two of Scaliger's conjectures and three of Voss's are accepted as certain, while none of Bentley's or Heinsius's are more than probable; none of the eighteenth century corrections of Catullus will stand, except perhaps *Nunc Celtiber es* in XXXIX 17; in the present century only Lachmann's *Graia* in LXVI 58 can be accepted as final. He especially disavows any intention of detracting from the greatness of eminent critics, many of whom he speaks of in terms of the highest appreciation, as Haupt and Lachmann, and notably of Munro, whom he stamps as a master-mind. It may, perhaps, be urged that the earlier commentators had a wider field to work in, and their emendations were the easier ones, while they left the more difficult passages for their successors; though on the other hand it can be said that the extent of knowledge of the present day is more vast, and the opportunities offered for the examination of MSS and by the schools of epigraphy counterbalance the advantages of the earlier critics. This desire to elevate the position of the scholars of the Renaissance is noticeable not only in the preface, but throughout the work, in frequent references to them and their labors in the notes. Not but that the later editors come in for a full share of notice, as Riese (1884), Bährens (1885), Benoist (1882), and Schmidt (1888), whose works have all been published since the first edition of Mr. Ellis's commentary in 1876, but the complaint is a just one that they contain very little that is new.

By far the most valuable part of Mr. Ellis's new work is the various Excursus appended to many of the poems. He there treats of the several points in dispute with a scholarly clearness, and a breadth of view worthy of the learned commentator of Catullus, acknowledging with frankness where an emendation or suggestion of another appears better than his own preconceived idea, yet defending with firmness his position, when it seems to him still the most rational.

There are about thirty of these essays, of which we can only notice:

(1). On X 9, Mr. Ellis accepts as plausible Munro's emendation of putting a full stop after *referret*, and making *Cur quisquam*, etc., a question, but objects that *nihil esse*, followed as it is by *Cur*, can only with violence be separated from it in construction; but Traube's suggestion, "*nihil neque ipsi Hoc praetore fuisse nec cohorti*," he considers as the cleverest of the emendations yet proposed, and may be what Catullus wrote, since the loose rhythm is in its favor, and *ipsi* can easily equal *mihi ipsi*, following as it does so closely on *respondi*; while

*Hoc praetore fuisse* might easily be corrupted into *Nec praetoribus esse* (pp. 39-40).

(2). On XVII 6, Mr. Ellis modifies his former opinion as to the genuineness of this verse, declaring himself as disposed to favor its authenticity.

(3). On XXIX 20 and 23 there is a lengthy excursus, the latter part of which is a discussion of the *opulentissime* of the MSS. Though Ellis retains in his notes his reading *urbis o pudet meae*, he apparently accepts Munro's suggestion of *urbis ob tuem ipsimae*, but modifies it by the substitution of *suae* for *ipsimae*, tracing the corruption as running from *opluemsue* to *opluentsue* then *opluentissime*, a course which appears highly probable; indeed it seems that the united thought of these two scholars has finally settled this desperate passage, barring out all other proposals. Ellis would thus make the city referred to Formiae, and not Rome, as Munro thinks.

(4). The LXVIII poem is the subject of a long prolegomenon, in which Ellis boldly maintains his point, in which he is assisted by Lachmann, Haupt, Riese, B. Schmidt, and others, that the poem forms a complete whole, though divisible into two, or perhaps three parts, the last twelve verses forming a kind of epilogue; in this he is opposed by Bergk, Schwabe, Munro, Bährens, and others. Ellis's grounds for his belief are that the repetition of vss. 20-24 in 94-98 are an "indication on the one hand that the two parts were not written simultaneously, on the other that they *are* parts of the same poem"; that "nothing could be a stronger proof of poverty of invention than the recurrence in two completely distinct poems of five identical verses"; and further, that "nowhere in the extant poems of Catullus can any ending be shown so abrupt as *Vltro ego deferrem, copia si qua foret* becomes on the separatist view; nowhere a beginning so startling as *Non possum reticere, deae, qua me Allius in re Iuuerit.*" Ellis claims that his opponents have completely ignored this point on which he lays much stress; and he further claims that the individuals apparently mentioned as two, in the different parts of the poem, are one and the same man, Allius Mallius.

So much has been said for and against the separation of 1-40 from 41-160 that it seems a work of supererogation to renew the discussion; but briefly we may say that the tone of the two poems (for such we conceive them to be) is so entirely different in composition and feeling that it would seem impossible for them to constitute a complete whole. That Catullus should decline so emphatically, and with such good cause, to send his friend any composition of his own, and should then straightway proceed to write a long poem of 120 verses, discoursing of Lesbia, Laodamia, and what not, appears at least improbable. The repetition of vss. 20-24, upon which Prof. Ellis lays such stress, does not seem a strong argument in favor of considering the two poems as one. Verses 1-40 were written under great mental strain from the loss of his brother, in referring to whom these four verses are particularly pathetic and beautiful; what wonder then that he should repeat them in a later poem, when suggested by the mention of the Troad in verse 88, a practice not uncommon among the best poets; 1-40 is written in the most prosaic manner, except when the mention of his brother is direct, and entirely unelaborated, whereas 41-160 is worked up with great care. Again, if considered as a whole, the transition from 40 to 41 is most abrupt, but with all respect to Mr. Ellis, 41 sqq. would not form an inele-

gant beginning to a new poem. That 1-40 was written by Catullus from Verona or Sirmio to Mallius at Baiae, or some place other than Rome, seems patent to us, while 41-160 give no evidence of where they were written, though they seem to have been composed at a sufficiently later period for his grief for his brother to be somewhat assuaged.

Whether the Mallius or Manlius of 1-40 was L. Manlius Torquatus seems to be still *sub iudice*, though Schwabe's arguments in its favor are clever and strong.

Again, it seems impossible that an Allius Mallius or a Mallius Allius should have existed in Rome, though Mr. Ellis teaches us (p. 401) that we should be careful what assertions we make in regard to Roman names.

If we turn to the MSS they do not help us much, their reading is so various, and the corrupt passing of an *n* before *l* into another *l* so very easy. Confining

ourselves to DPGO, in verse 11, we find *manli* DP, *mali* O, *mali* G; in 30, appears *mali* GO; in 41, *quam fallius* GO, *quam salius* P, *quam fallimus* D; in 52, *ali* GP, *alli* O, *aliis* D; in 68, *manlius* DG, *allius marg.* *manllius* O; in 170, *alliis* all MSS. It can be seen from these examples that the external evidence of the MSS does not carry us far towards a solution of the problem.

These are but a few brief points in the argument, but from an entirely dispassionate standpoint, viewing the evidence as a whole, we feel that were we a higher tribunal, instead of a very inferior one, we should be compelled to reverse the decision of the upper court, which we freely grant Mr. Ellis to be.

Mr. Ellis still holds to the opinion expressed in his first edition, that the name of the poet was Quintus and not Gaius; the arguments are so strong for the latter *praenomen* that we do not see how Mr. Ellis can fail to recognize them; to be sure he is supported by such eminent scholars as Lachmann, Mommsen, Haupt, and Scaliger, but of these Lachmann and Mommsen were not acquainted with G and O, and Scaliger had his emendation to support in LXVII 12. Ellis bases his opinion on the authority of the Datanus, Riccardianus, Cujacianus, and the Colbertinus MSS, the first of which he thinks very highly of, though all four are usually considered to be inferior MSS; and on a passage in Pliny's N. H. XXXVII 81, *filius strumae Noni eius quem Catullus poeta in sella curuli visum indigne tulit*. It is to be observed in regard to the passage from Pliny that the MSS by no means agree, some of them having the words as quoted above, and others placing Q. before the word Catullus, which Mr. Ellis thinks of great importance. He has been at pains to examine, either personally or vicariously, some twenty-one MSS of Pliny, with a result that does not seem to us encouraging to his cause; of these the oldest two (the Bambergensis and the Chifletianus), of the tenth and eleventh centuries respectively, omit the Q. and give *n̄* Catulus; of the later codices, 4 of the thirteenth, 2 of the fourteenth, and 6 of the fifteenth century omit the Q., while only 1 of the twelfth, 2 of the thirteenth, 2 of the fourteenth, and 2 of the fifteenth place the Q. before Catullus. Now it is not at all improbable that in these the Q. crept in from the *quem* which precedes it; or arose from a confusion between the old capital forms of Q and C; or again, of a confusion between the *praenomen* of Quintus Catulus and that of the poet, especially as this actually occurs in the Datanus, which gives the form *Catuli*.

On the other hand, none of the better or the best MSS of Pliny give Quintus, and Jerome especially states in his Chronicle that the poet's name was Gaius, writing it out in full, whilst Apuleius Apolog. 10 writes C. Catullus.

It is noted with pleasure that Ellis has changed the spelling from Virgil to Vergil throughout this edition, in deference, he tells us, "to the arguments of the Roman jurist Castalio, *De Vergili nominis scribendi recta ratione*, Romae 1594.

Prof. Ellis's volume is by no means a reprint of that of 1876. There are comparatively few omissions from his former work, while the pages of the new edition are teeming with rich illustrative passages in both Greek and Latin, which no one but a deeply-read and profound scholar like Mr. Ellis could supply; this is especially the case with the quotations in Greek, from which his wide reading has enabled him to make such valuable selections. Again, in the Latin references he has wisely aimed to quote from "the predecessors or contemporaries, rather than from the followers of Catullus"; not only are these passages more pertinent than many of those in the first edition, but their number is so much increased that they occupy a by no means small proportion of the increase of 116 pages in this over the first edition.

Of the Clarendon Press work, as usual, there is nothing to be said except in commendation.

Amongst all these words of praise it is disagreeable to have to find fault, and grave fault too, with the index, which falls far short of any reasonable standard. It was always a drawback to the first edition that it was not indexed, and we hailed with delight the announcement that this want had been supplied in the present volume, but our disappointment was all the more keen when we found how insufficient it was. It purports to be an "Index of persons and things referred to in the Commentary," and we started to make a list of some of the more notable omissions, taken at random, such as Erycina, Aeneas, Ariadne, Prometheus, Helicon, Pessinus, Cybele, etc., but soon found that this meant the compiling of a new index, in comparison to which the present one would be but a small fraction, and abandoned the attempt.

It is not too often that the world is presented with the exhaustive and learned work of so ripe a scholar as Mr. Ellis, and every student of Catullus owes him a meed of thanks second only in gratitude to that due to the poet himself.

— WILLIAM H. KLAPP.

The Latin Heptateuch, critically reviewed by JOHN E. B. MAYOR, M. A. Cambridge, University Press, 1889.

This interesting translation of the first seven books of the Old Testament into hexameter verse is, up to the present time, inaccessible in any one work, having undergone a strange history in its fragmentary publication. The first 165 verses of Genesis were published by Wm. Morel in 1560, and have been often reprinted in editions of Tertullian and Cyprian. In 1733 Martène added 1276 verses more from a MS of the ninth century, which completed the book of Genesis with the exception of chapter IX and a part of chapter X. In 1852 Cardinal Pitra published in the *Spicilegium Solesmense* the missing fragment of Genesis, the books of Exodus, Deuteronomy and Joshua, and parts of Leviticus and Numbers. Before his death, which occurred Feb. 9, 1889, he added

supplements to Leviticus and Numbers, and printed the book of Judges as far as to c. XVIII (*Analecta sacra et classica Sp. Sol. parata*, Paris and Rome, 1888). We have in all 5375 hexameter verses and 175 hendecasyllabics in lyrical passages. They are to be brought together in a critical edition by R. Peiper in the Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. The work of Mayor is preliminary to this promised edition, and is based upon the manuscript C, of the tenth century, belonging to Trinity College, Cambridge. Pitra had already transcribed this and collated two Laon MSS (A, B) for his edition of 1852, and he did not then publish the whole material because he hoped, without success, to find a new manuscript. C shows much divergence from Pitra's text, and its readings are generally, though not always, better. It is strange that so little has been known in Germany of anything but the version of Genesis, and that even Hartel and L. Müller in treating of the poem critically were not aware of Pitra's important publication. The burning question has hitherto been in regard to the authorship of this version. The manuscripts and catalogues have assigned it to various Christian authors, Tertullian, Cyprian, Alcimus Avitus, Juvencus, etc. The theory of Juvencus's authorship has been stoutly maintained by Pitra, even as late as 1888, as well as by Bähr, Schrödl, Daniel, Bernhardt and Gams. Metrical and stylistic considerations have led most critics to reject this claim, which is disposed of by Mayor, who shows that the passage E 526 ff. was originally addressed to Theodosius by Claudian in a poem of the year 396. It may seem gratuitous to give further grounds against J.'s authorship, but the theory of his connection with the poem has died so hard that it is perhaps justifiable to mention some other considerations:

a. The author of the Heptateuch has a predilection, amounting almost to a passion, for beginning a verse with the convenient dactyl *Illicet*, of which there are about 40 instances scattered throughout the poem: Juvencus has *none* in 3210 verses. b. Juvencus is very fond of long honorific titles of the Deity (see Marold's index). While the author of the Hept. uses *Tonans* = *Deus* with some frequency (G 65, 141, 168, etc.), there is a noticeable lack of the feature mentioned. The following expressions equivalent to *Deus* are not found in Juvencus: *Rex*, E 1162, 1191; *Potens*, G 205; *Maximus*, G 102. c. With the exception of a simile or two (I 687-689) or a "fine" description of nature, Juvencus takes no liberties with the text of Scripture, but compare:

Sethum (*read* Semum) Chamumque Jafetumque  
In numerum solitos mollitum tundere ferrum

(G 226, 7) and G 179, E 443, 468, and the treatment of Exod. IV 24, Exod. X.

d. Juvencus omits lists of proper names (Mat. I; X 2-4), but in the Hept. a laborious effort is made to bring them in, with results like

qui nomine vero  
Dicuntur Ariac Hadachar Godullagomurus, G 426, 7.

and after a hard struggle with the Gergasenes and Ammonites (E 1143 seq.) the author makes the naïve confession:

Sed neque quam multae species nec nomina quae sunt  
Lex numeris astricta potest depromere fando.

Other such lists are given in Gen. V, X, XI, Jo. 375, etc. *ε*. In E 729 and throughout the book of Joshua Hept. has *Jēsus* as a dissyllable, while everywhere in Juvenius the word is a trisyllable: *Iēsus*.

Ebert (Allg. Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters im Abendlande<sup>3</sup>, Leip. 1889, 114 ff.), in treating of the authorship of the Hept., is inclined to ascribe the first 600 verses of Genesis to Juvenius, while in the remainder he sees the work of another author. The latter half of Genesis, he says, is much inferior to the first, especially as it becomes greatly abbreviated in its treatment, and at last is the crudest sort of versification. This theory of more than one hand in the authorship (which Mayor does not notice) cannot be accepted for a moment. The characteristic peculiarities of Genesis are maintained throughout. Even the condensation of the latter part is not so significant as might appear. The first 632 lines of the version of Genesis are concerned with the first 18 chapters of the Bible, which include 458 (prose) verses of Bible-text; or, in the first 632 lines the average is: .72 Bible-verses to the hexameter line. The last 863 lines (32 chapters) include 1075 verses of Bible-text, or 1.24 Bible-verses to the hexameter line. Yet in Gen. X (which falls before the 400th line) 32 verses are treated in 18 lines, or 1.77 Bible-verses to the hex. line, while the version of Joshua covers 658 verses in 585 lines, making the average of 1.12 Bible-verses to the hex. line.

It is due to Peiper that the authorship of the poem has been finally assigned, upon good manuscript authority, to Cyprian, and this not the African church-father, but in all probability the Bishop of Toulon in the middle of the sixth century. In company with Firminus and Viventius he wrote (or furnished the material for) the life of Caesarius of Arles, which is found in Migne's Patrol. Lat. LXVII 1001 ff. That in this life there can be found no resemblances to the style of the Hept. need not disparage the theory, for though in c. 39 *vae mihi misero Cypriano!* might point to him as the actual writer of the memoir, the succeeding *inter quos etiam sanctus Cyprianus Telonensis magnus et clarus enituit*, certainly shows that he could not have composed it all. Perhaps the disclaimer of all rhetorical art in the *praefatio* is also significant. At any rate, all the indications point to a Cyprian of Gaul, who flourished about this time, as the author of the whole version of the Heptateuch. The form of Mayor's work is discursive in the extreme, and with its dedications, quotations, biographies, "sponsors" and reminiscences is spread out to make a volume of 339 pages, without much regard to scientific method in arrangement. It is to be regretted that there is not a better description of the MSS, especially C. Mayor brings to his work extraordinary qualifications: a severe Latin scholar, with that thorough training in metrics possessed by English versifiers, he has also a mastery of the Fathers and especially of the Christian Latin poets, and makes brilliant use of this material on every page. The style is Mayor's own, and is too characteristic to be capable of description. His copious side-remarks are never dull, and are jubilant, censorious or laudatory according to circumstances. There is a rather amusing and self-conscious patronage of Pitra, whose valuable work is certainly inferior to Arevalo's in critical acumen, and not deserving the over-praise which it receives. The long preface (pp. vii-lxvi) gives a history of editions and previous criticism, nothing having escaped the notice of the author. There is also a very valuable summary of the metrical and linguistic

facts which this monument brings to light. The term "initial *æ*" on p. xlix is ambiguous, and should be "*æ* in the first syllable"; compare the examples given on the next page, and E 598 *hæres*, E 775 *hæreant*. To the list on p. l should be added: L 16 *mderente*, E 307 *mderore*, 456 *hysopi*. To the list of words which are shortened in the first syllable should be added Jo. 516 *libamina* (but cf. *libare*, four lines later). The body of the book is given to critical emendations, some of which are very luminous, and in accordance with which the facts marshal themselves in line like drilled troops. E. g. E 82 *lictorum*, 196 *se Rex* for *senex*, 1323 *Auses*, etc. "Bentley's slashing hook," for which the author sighs, has certainly descended into his hands, and he purges unsparingly against the testimony of all the MSS. Mayor corrects everything (even the epigrams of his deceased master Kennedy), and we doubt whether Cyprian would recognize his own poem in many verses. He lays the blame upon scribes in regard to liberties which are consistently repeated throughout the poem—so *fiunt*, G 6, 282, 429, E 450, 774, etc. Why should we attribute to the scribe the frequently recurring *vddentem*, etc., which all the MSS attest? So with *daturus* G 224, 878. I cannot think it necessary to change *præter*, which occurs in G 1036, E 694, Jo. 12, Ju. 402. Granted that such liberties offend all of one's metrical sensibilities, is it not abundantly shown elsewhere that, in matters of prosody, our Cyprian is *capable de tout*? Why might not *cūpitam* stand at the head of E 114, in the light of the numerous examples on p. li? So Mayor does away with the ἀπαξ λεγ. *clarigenus* E 1187. As to correcting proper names because of inconsistent quantities, if the Christian poetry of the time shows anything, it is that the greatest liberty is allowable in the metrical treatment of such names. So great a purist as Juvenecus himself allows perfect freedom in the matter. Confidence in Mayor's results is weakened by the way in which he subsequently takes back what he had defended at length—see the supplement, p. 239. At N 686 there is too much dwelling upon a mere typographical error in Pitra—the printing of *umbra* for *unda*. The final result in G 6, 91 and 138 is hardly satisfactory. I do not think that the author can establish the forms *domni*, etc., for Cyprian. Strange that the verse G 225 has escaped the critical eye of so many theologian-editors who have up to the present allowed *Sethum* to stand, while any Sunday-school scholar would amend to *Semum* (Gen. V 31). The verse E 563 I would amend:

Cui sit gloria dum honore pollens.

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

*Note.* I take this opportunity to make corrections of C. Marold's text of Juvenecus (Leipsic, 1886):

II 74, for *orabunt* read *orabant*.

II 191, for *senior* read *senior matris*.

IV 302, for *calvavit* read *calcavit*.

IV 663, for *possesso* read *possessio*.

IV 716, for *procerum* read *procerum solus*.—J. T. H.

G. H. BALG, Ph.D. A Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language, with especial reference to English and German. With a preface by Prof. FRANCIS A. MARCH, LL. D. Mayville, Wisconsin, 1887-1889.

The ninth and last part of this work has just appeared, and the author is certainly to be congratulated on the result, taken as a whole. The chief value of the book is undoubtedly to be found in the large mass of materials, assembled in a single handy volume. The meanings of the words are abundantly illustrated: in most of the later articles every occurrence of a given word in the entire literature is noted. What a pity that the author did not, with blind trust in the unequalled value of such collections, make a complete concordance of the entire body of the Gothic literature! He has exhibited sufficient pluck and faithfulness for such a task. The value and permanence of his work would have been thus increased manifold, and he might have made room by reducing the pleasant etymological *causeries*—interesting enough they are, to be sure—without seriously impairing the value of his work.

I agree cordially with Professor March and Dr. Balg, in their prefaces, that Gothic is the fundamental Germanic language, the Sanskrit among them. The phonetics and morphology of either Old High German, or Anglo-Saxon do not present ancient Germanic speech in such limpid perspicuity as Gothic. Gothic is *not* Proto-Germanic any more than Sanskrit is Indo-European, but each stands at the very threshold of the reconstructed period of speech—that period which we designate in the one case by Proto-Germanic, in the other by Indo-European. Thus the value of Gothic radiates in two directions. The student of German speech finds in it more help than in any other dialect, when he grapples with the multiform developments of later Germanic speech; the student of language in any other I. E. domain finds in Gothic on the whole the forms and functions nearest, and most in sympathy with those of his own language.

This pivotal position of Gothic points out a lesson which Teutonic scholars in America should quickly appropriate. It is this, that they cannot stop short at Gothic: they must in a reasonable measure also understand that attraction which constantly brings the student of the remaining I. E. languages over into their domain. We may as well be plain-spoken. In our belief one can no more understand Gothic or Old High German without a knowledge of the more prominent I. E. languages, than one can understand later German forms of speech without a knowledge of Gothic and Old High German. The apparatus of a serious-minded German student is not complete without a correct apprehension of the speech-forms of at least the more prominent I. E. languages, Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. Need we go into details? The writer needs but to refer to *ablaut* and Verner's law, or the I. E. surd and sonant aspirates to indicate his meaning. He is willing to add that he has scarcely met with an instance, in which these phenomena were understood fully, down to the bone, without this background. He begs, therefore, to supplement the remarks of Professor March, by urging upon students of German in the earlier years of their career an acquaintance with the general outline of I. E. speech.

I do not believe that I do Dr. Balg an injustice in pointing out, that the want of just such training, or perhaps rather of a sufficient amount of it, forms one of the most conspicuous defects of his excellent work. Let me dwell upon one example somewhat at length. It is his treatment of the relation of *frathnan*

'to ask' to OHG. *forskōn*, NHG. *forschen* 'to inquire' on p. 102. He describes *forskōn* as = \**forhskōn*, and explains the root-syllable \**forh* as due to metathesis of \**freh* in *frathna*. Neither explanation is correct. There never was a Proto-German \**forhskōn*, but only *forskōn* without *h*. This appears clearly, if we compare Latin *po(r)scō*, Sk. *pr̥chāmi*, Zend *peresa-*. The final *ē* of the I. E. root *preh* was lost in front of the inchoative suffix *-sko-* before the separation, before Germanic speech: the 'ground-form' of all these is \**pr̥skō*, and this never presented any opportunity to turn a *k* into *h* by Grimm's law. Worse still is the assumption of metathesis in this assumed \**forh*. Even from the point of view of German alone one can understand that *forh* is the so-called weak, toneless form to *freh*, holding to it the same relation as *bud-* in *budum* to *biud-* in *biuda*, as *bund-* in *bundum* to *bind-* in *binda*, as *vaurp-* (*vorp-*) in *vaurpum* to *vaīrp-* (*verp-*) in *vaīrpa*, etc. In just such cases a modest knowledge of comparative grammar has a most clarifying and pervasive influence. *frathna* corresponds well with its strong root-form to Sk. *pr̥agna*, but *forskōn* to Sk. *pr̥chāmi*, and we see here that *or* is the German rendition of the I. E. *r*-vowel, which appears as the Sk. *r*-vowel.

Similar cases are the following: On p. 45a *banja* 'wound' is compared with *φόνος*, a very old comparison, which goes back to Pott, Etymologische Forschungen, I, 225. But now it is a commonplace of grammar that *φόνος* together with *βελω* both represent in Greek the I. E. root *ghen* (Sk. *hānmi*, *ghands*), and the initial of such a root must appear in German either as (*g*)*v* or *g*. As a matter of fact Old Norse *gunnr*, Ags. *gūð*, OHG. *gundea* 'slaughter' are the representatives of this root in the German dialects. For *banja* cf. KZ. XXV 171.

The Latin phonetist will scarcely be grateful to our author for imposing upon him the duty of deriving *nūdus* from \**nugdus*; the student of I. E. phonetics will find it equally hard to mediate between the *u* in \**nugdus*, the *a* of Sk. *nagna-*, and Goth. *naqaps*. See p. 293a. *nūdus* for \**no(g)vedos*, like *pr̥dens* for *providens*, establishes an almost exact equation between the Gothic and the Latin and removes the burden of accounting for the relation of a Latin *ñ* to Sk. *a* = Goth. *a* = I. E. *o*.

A few more points of the same sort may be added. On p. 371b *skēwjan* 'to go, walk' is identified with Greek *σεβεσθαι* and Sk. root *cyn*. But the two last are from an I. E. root *q̥ey*, and the assumption of a 'ground-form' *sk̥jeveσθαι* for *σεβεσθαι* is against all known phonetics of the language. On p. 210 *jiuka* 'strife, anger' is compared with *ἰσχυρή* in the face of every chance. *jiuka* surely contains the same root as *juk* 'yoke,' and is therefore to be compared to root *zey* = I. E. *yeug* with initial spirant *yod*; *ἰσχυρή* with initial rough breathing indicates a totally different root with initial *j̥* (*i* consonants), I. E. *jeudh*. In the Greek index (p. 603) *ἰσχυρή* is referred to *jēr*, an evident misprint. On p. 217b *kilpei* 'womb' is compared with Sk. *jāhara*, on p. 229a an attempt is made to identify the same Sk. word with *q̥ipus*, but it appears here in the form *gathāras* (!), with two misprints. The Sk. word cannot be compared with both Gothic words: it is in fact identical with *-q̥iprs* in *laus-q̥iprs* 'empty-bellied.'

Dr. Balg does not in his work make pretence of being a Sanskrit scholar; nevertheless the demand is not an unreasonable one that the words of that language be cited correctly, and according to some single method of transcrip-

tion. This is not the case. On p. 193b we have *vid* 'to be white' for *vit*; p. 219a *jñu-bād* 'bending the knee,' where the mark ~ designates the palatal quality of the ñ and the length of the ā. Similarly on p. 223a we have *jānami*: both ā and ā are simply long ā. In *jānau* the ~ belongs to the n: the a of the second syllable is at the best entitled to a makron; similarly on p. 324b we have *ṛ-nā-mi* and *ṛ-nvā-mi*. On p. 225a *gāni* for *jāni*; 111b *pra* and *pūrna* for *prā* and *pūrṇa*; p. 16b *ayus* for *āyus*; p. 352b Sk. *syd* for *syā* as the feminine of *syas*. On p. 68a we have *dharshas* 'boldness,' on p. 108b *pruśvā* 'drop': *śh* in the first and *ṣ* in the second are the same sound. On p. 515a *udra* 'wish,' on p. 516b *viras* 'man': the initial sounds of both words are the same. On p. 81a *pitṛvya*, on p. 371b *cju*: *y* and *j* in these words are the identical sound. Truly a motley assemblage!

In this connection a few other points may be noted. On p. 87a *plta* instead of *plta* is assumed as the ground-form of Sk. *puṭa*; p. 370a *koiv* is compared correctly with \**skarus*: in the Greek index it appears incorrectly as *koiv*. The verb *bi-rodjan* 'to murmur' is wanting on p. 54a. I have not been able to find it anywhere in the book. The statement on p. 33a that Goth. *asts* is 'allied to Gr. ὄζος' is scarcely strong enough: ὄζος, or still more palpably Aeolic ὄδος, is sound for sound equal to *asts*. On p. 334a *inju* is omitted in the etymological discussion of *saian*; on p. 55 under *binga* the related *φειγω*, *fugio*, Sk. *bhuḡ* deserve mention, in spite of the difference in the quality of the final consonants.

There is one more serious defect, which we especially entreat the author to correct, in case his work should live to pass through a second edition. I refer to the utter absence of references to etymological literature. Etymology is at the same time the most important and the most difficult member of the sciences, which cluster about the study of language. We realize the difficulty more and more, as the study of comparative grammar becomes older. How many words are there for which two and three different etymologies are now contending, though their derivation seemed forever settled to the generation of grammarians preceding ours! They can be counted by scores and hundreds. The etymologist cannot afford to shoulder the responsibility of deciding, without at least giving his readers an opportunity for overhauling his results by giving short references to the works, in which the word has been discussed. The presence of such references lends permanent value, for instance, to the etymological labors of the late Dr. Vaniček on the field of Greek and Latin etymology, though his personal opinion is often not acceptable. The space consumed by them is comparatively small; their value is paramount. By the way, there is a somewhat pathetic analogy between the authors of the two works, Vaniček and Balg. Vaniček started life as 'kaiserlich-königlich-galizischer Cameralgefallenverwaltungsconceptspraktikant' (see *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Lateinischen Sprache*<sup>2</sup>, p. iv), and performed a large share of his labors in Neuhaus in Bohemia. Balg has undertaken broad philological operations in Mayville, Wisconsin. The labors of each were carried on in the teeth of adverse circumstances: lack of books, intellectual isolation, etc. The day will never come, when these studies will no longer seem to some minds the most refreshing and sustaining of all mental pursuits.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

Homer's *Odyssey*, Books I-IV; edited on the basis of the Ameis-Hentze edition by B. PERRIN, Professor in Adelbert College of Western Reserve University. Square 8vo. Greek and English indices. 229 pp. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1889.

This edition of the *Odyssey*  $\alpha$ - $\delta$  belongs to the College Series of Greek Authors which Messrs. Ginn & Co. are publishing under the editorial supervision of Professor J. W. White of Harvard and Professor Seymour of Yale. It is the second portion of Homer in the series to appear, the first, published about two years ago, being an edition of the *Iliad* A-I by Professor Seymour. Professor Perrin, as is briefly stated in the title-page of his book, has based the commentary on the Ameis-Hentze edition of 1884, and his notes are therefore mainly exegetical. He has, however, added an appendix which, although of much less elaborate character than the extensive *Anhang* of the German edition, contains in admirably concise form much that is of value for critical purposes. The text is that of Dindorf revised by Hentze, Leipzig, Teubner, 1884, but it may be noted that Professor Perrin uses brackets in passages which are confessedly uncertain much less freely than the German editor, and that he is now and then distinctly in favor of retaining verses which are bracketed in the German edition, e. g.  $\alpha$  278 =  $\beta$  197,  $\gamma$  95, 199 f. (cf. Appendix).

In accordance with the statement in his preface, Professor Perrin has not simply translated the German notes, but has freely adapted them to what he believes to be the requirements of American college classes. This work has certainly been extremely well done, and with an originality and independence which makes one inclined to ask why so good a Homeric scholar as Professor Perrin should wish to "base" his edition on that of another editor. It really seems hardly worth while that he should suppress his individual judgment as he does, for example, in the notes on  $\alpha$  151,  $\beta$  60 (cf. Appendix). The mass of Homeric commentary accumulated by a long line of scholars is now so immense and has so largely become common property that it almost seems a question whether the American editor really owes so very much more to the notes of Ameis-Hentze than those scholars owed to their immediate predecessors. The *form* of the American book agrees unquestionably quite closely with that of the German, but in general Professor Perrin might very properly say, as Ameis did in the preface to his first edition, that he had used the work of other scholars *mit selbständigem Urtheil*.

If, however, the book be judged simply according to its professions, there can be no doubt that the exegetical notes are a distinct improvement upon those of the German original, always remembering of course that no attempt has been made to furnish any large amount of such supplementary material as is to be found in the Ameis-Hentze *Anhang*. Any one who will take the trouble to make a systematic comparison of the notes in the two editions will be convinced of this. Compare, for example, the notes on  $\alpha$  14-21, 53;  $\gamma$  109, 171;  $\delta$  231 f., 636 etc. Many new notes too have been added. On the other hand it is not an easy matter to find corresponding notes of Ameis-Hentze which are superior; cf.  $\alpha$  45 where there is no citation of identical verses,  $\beta$  100 where no remark on *ταπηλειός* is made,  $\delta$  477 where there is no comment on *δυνερέος*. These are surely not very weighty omissions. Professor Perrin, moreover, shows markedly in his commentary the thoroughness and simplicity in syntactical explana-

tion which is certainly a characteristic of the better class of college text-books that have been produced by American scholars; cf.  $\beta$  43, and the many references to standard grammars. Most helpful also are the frequent comparisons of Attic usage. Now and then English idioms analogous to the Greek are introduced to excellent purpose; cf.  $\beta$  9, where we find the "assemble and meet together" of the Prayer Book; again,  $\beta$  345 the formula from Genesis I, "and it was evening and it was morning," and  $\delta$  380 "weather-bound," 540 "live and breathe," 743 "dear child," etc.

There can then be no question in regard to the admirable character of Professor Perrin's notes as a whole, but with this very certain opinion I may yet be allowed to offer a few criticisms upon particular features in them. And first of all there seems to be too much statistical information mixed in with the exegesis. Such remarks as have been most fitly placed in the appendix against  $\alpha$  4, 21;  $\beta$  20;  $\delta$  2, 4, 342 are freely scattered through the explanatory notes. They are so numerous that it is hardly worth while to cite examples. Frequently also statistics are given without references, as  $\gamma$  248, "The last five feet occur ten times in the Iliad." There ought, it seems to me, to be more than this, or else nothing at all, and I cannot think that the citing of *iterati* and *formulae* "for the eye merely" (cf. preface) is a good plan when it tends, as it does in the present case, to make the notes a little tedious. Seymour's Iliad A-I in this same series has less statistical information and more citation of passages from other poets which are calculated constantly to stimulate the student's interest in comparative literature, besides giving to the commentary a very charming literary flavor more or less foreign, by the way, to its German original. The notes to the Odyssey are not lacking in this quality, but it is not distinctly prominent and is obscured to some degree by statistics.

In the preface to his book Professor Perrin says in explanation of the critical notes in the appendix which contain the principal variations of the best MSS and the readings of some prominent scholars, that "these data will not seem pedantic to those whose library privileges are limited." This is excellent, and similar data touching *Realien* would, I am sure, have been very useful to students and more especially to teachers. Such references have been given in a number of cases, e. g.  $\alpha$  333 (appendix),  $\gamma$  10 (appendix), 440, 464 (appendix),  $\delta$  627, but in connection with  $\alpha$  357 and  $\beta$  94 Blümner's excellent discussion of spinning and weaving (Technol. d. Gr. u. Röm. S. 109 ff.) might well have been referred to. I have further noted the following passages where Helbig (Das Hom. Epos) has important and pertinent remarks:  $\alpha$  440,  $\gamma$  399 (p. 124 anm. 5), 63 (pp. 358 ff.), 162 (pp. 158 ff.), 384, 425 f., 437 (pp. 266 f.), 408 (p. 98), 460 (pp. 353 ff.; interesting citation p. 358 of 1 Sam. II 13 ff.);  $\delta$  42 (p. 100), 71 ff. (see index s. v. Menelaos), 131 (p. 108 anm. 13), 305 (p. 205), 618 (p. 367 and in general with regard to Phoenician importations). Nearly all these references might furnish helpful suggestions to the teacher and would in no wise usurp his functions.

It remains to call attention to a few places of minor importance where perhaps some improvement might be possible or where a query suggests itself.  $\alpha$  64, see Butcher and Lang's interesting note on this verse. 92, a note on *ἐλικας* in the appendix desirable. 136, *προχόω* is called a *lokaler Dativ* by All.; a dative of means by Perrin; no note in appendix on the change. 267, *ἐν γούνασι*

*κεῖται* seems worth a note in the appendix. β 20, AH., while admitting the difficulty of so doing (*Anhang*), construe *πύματον* with *τόν*; this is not noted in the appendix. 100, a note on *τανηλεγέος* desirable. γ 315, is the prohibitory character of the *μη* clause beyond a doubt? δ 195, add reference to ο 50. 489, a note on *ἀδεύκει* desirable. In the useful bibliography which Professor Perrin has appended to his book the *latest* edition of Merry's *Odyssey* (1887), and that of Keep's *Autenrieth* (1888) should be noted. I have observed but one misprint, β 396 (note), for *πλάζει* read *πλάζε*.

The exegetical notes are printed on the same page with the text, according to the plan which the supervising editors have most wisely adopted, and the work of printer and publisher is of the same very admirable character which is to be seen in the other books of Messrs. Ginn & Co.'s College Series. Such excellent exegetical editions of Homer as these which have been begun by Professor Seymour and Professor Perrin have never before been put into the hands of younger students either in this country or, so far as I know, in England. If only we had larger portions of Homer so edited, it can hardly be doubted that they would be in great demand. As it is, teachers even of beginners want for their classes more than three books of the *Iliad* or four of the *Odyssey*.

J. R. WHEELER.

Elene; Judith; Athelstan, or the Fight at Brunanburh; and Byrhtnoth, or the Fight at Maldon: Anglo-Saxon poems. Translated by JAMES M. GARNETT, M. A., LL. D. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1889.

Much of what one might venture to say on the subject of how Anglo-Saxon poetry should be translated would, in all probability, soon become mere anachronism. There has been enough of that sort of criticism to establish this probability, if not indeed to raise it into the domain of demonstrated proof. Before we are prepared to make exact estimates of a translation, we must have the key to a thorough sympathy with the original, and such appreciation is born of accurate knowledge. Obviously then, while in the very midst of an inductive study of the art-form of the Anglo-Saxon poets, while the sifting and the resifting of collected facts is carrying us along by the gradual steps of theory to theory, it would be an act of rash precipitancy to declare the induction closed, and to fix a corresponding standard of judicial criticism. The belief that we are rapidly approaching a knowledge of the mechanical structure of Anglo-Saxon verse is surely well founded, but it is even yet perilous to predict the end. And when that end has been reached, a new discipline will doubtless be required to lead us to a quick and responsive perception of the more subtle, the more vital elements of the early poet's workmanship.

But, to be more concrete, of all recent translations of Anglo-Saxon verse, the method employed by Professor Garnett in his translation of the *Béowulf* is undoubtedly that which has become most familiar to the general student, while the judgment passed upon it by scholars is equally familiar to technical readers. In introducing to the public the present volume of translations, therefore, it is almost if not quite sufficient merely to say that Professor Garnett has adhered to his previous canon of literal line-for-line translation, with its disavowal of "ideal correctness of rhythm." It cannot be said that the translator

has made any marked progress in the handling of his irregular rhythm, but he is as conscientiously literal as ever, and as conservatively correct in sense as one could desire. There is, however, one feature in this method that has gained prominence, namely, the marking of the metrical stress of pronouns, of auxiliary verbs, and of subordinate connectives. But the marks of this sort thus intended to make the rhythm eloquent to the eye are in many cases quite superfluous, in others they are either capricious or positively misplaced. For example, a mechanical adherence to the order of words in the original has occasioned such lines as are represented by the following three occurring on page 9:

"There wás on [each] earl easily seen "

"There wás to be seen treasure-gem set "

"[Then] wás the blessed Helena mindful."

Surely these stress marks are not superfluous, for no one would instinctively read in the manner required by them. But why require such distortion of the natural movement? If the additional unstressed syllable does not permit one to group these lines in a general way with such as:

"Thén it was plain that victory gave,"

that is to say, if the first stress cannot in each case be put upon the first syllable, it is easy enough to change them to an exact agreement, thus:

There on [each] earl was easily seen

There to be seen was treasure-gem set

[Then] was mindful the blessèd Helena.

The last line might also be put into this form:

[Then] the blessèd Helena was mindful,

this would retain the contiguity of "mindful" and "bold." To cite one more example, it will be agreed that it is not difficult to decide between:

"Then wás of the proud ones the force in joy"

and

Then of the proud ones the force was in joy

(or,

Of the proud ones then the force was in joy).

In reading Professor Garnett's lines the feeling grows upon one that he could have increased the smoothness of his version without departing from the essentials of his doctrine of line-for-line literalness, by this simplest sort of revision. The slightest change in the order of words, instead of destroying the ruggedness, as it is called, of the original, would often lead to a closer reproduction with the additional gain of smoothness—that quality which the translator has been too ready to sacrifice. Thus, for example, in translating *Elene*, lines 51 f.:

cyning præate fōr,  
herge, tō hilde

it is desirable, according to Professor Garnett's theory, to retain the effect of the apposition of *herge* to *præte*, which, to say the least, is as effectively accomplished by giving prominent stress to each :

the king marched with host  
with army to battle,

as by the less easy movement, which also violates the simple law of the relative stress of the grammatical categories :

" the king with host marched  
with army to battle."

Whatever may be thought of Anglo-Saxon poetry, it cannot be pronounced obscure. Its reiteration of substantive notions under metrical stress, its variation of epithet, the force and directness of its emphasis, and the absence of subjectivity, are prominent characteristics, and these are incompatible with obscurity. Professor Garnett has not done his utmost to keep his versions equally free from this quality; on the contrary, he is willing to admit (see his *Béowulf*) "much inversion and occasional obscurity" for the sake of maintaining his canon inviolate. That the sense of the translation can at times be most quickly determined by turning to the original is, therefore, an admitted defect which we are called upon to tolerate for a reason which has apparently more weight with the translator than it can possibly have with his readers. This emboldens one to suggest a modification of the line-for-line version into a period-for-period version. A gain in effectiveness of movement and in lucidity of style would, it is believed, be thus put within easy reach.

This new volume is in every way worthy to be placed by the side of Professor Garnett's widely-known version of the *Béowulf*.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, Vol. XLIV.<sup>1</sup>

Pp. 1-24, 406-430. F. Blass. Studies in Demosthenes (continued from Vol. XLIII 268; A. J. P. X 368). II. There are cases in which the MSS cannot help us in finding the true reading. The oration against Spudias (XLI) and that for Phormio (XXXVI) show that in the speeches for court *οὗτος* denotes the plaintiff, *οὗτος*, *οὗτος* and *ὁδε* (*ὁδὲ*) the defendant. Exceptions occur only when there is a contrast to the party absent (Zenoth. 11 f.) For proper names *οὗτος* is the correct pronoun and regularly follows; when it precedes, a contrast is implied. The article is usually omitted before the name of plaintiff and defendant, usually employed before the names of gods except in cases like *νῆ Δία* and *μὲ Δία* (also *πρὸς Δίος* Lept. 43). A study of the Leptinea shows that the article is omitted before other proper names except when reference is made to something previously mentioned or well known (*ἀναφορά*). The same is the case with *βασιλεύς* = *rex Persarum*. We always find *οἱ Ἕλληνες*, except in the predicate, and *ἡ Ἑλλάς*, *ἡ Ἀσία*, *ἡ Εὐρώπη*, *ἡ Ἀττικὴ*, which were considered adjectives. The names of other countries are treated like the proper names; so also provinces, cities, and wards, if they are considered as a unity and not put in contrast with another place. Fixed formulae dispense with the article, e. g. *οἱ ἐκ Πειραιῶς* like *οἱ ἐν ἄστει* or *ἐξ ἄστεως*, *εἰς Πειραιᾶ καταβαίνειν*, *οἱ ἐντὸς τείχους*; so also *Ἑλλησποντος*, but always *ὁ Πόντος*. The modern Greeks constantly use the article before proper names, and though this dates back many centuries, it can be said in defence of the much-abused copyists that they have seldom made a mistake, as a study of the first nine speeches shows. In the Pseudo-Demosthenean speeches it is somewhat different. A short paragraph on the articular infinitive in Demosthenes and a discussion of doubtful passages close the very interesting article.

III. Aorist and imperfect. One of the greatest difficulties in the Greek language is the relation between aorist and present-imperfect. The article is called forth by the strange remarks of O. Riemann in 'la question de l'aoriste grec' (Mélanges Graux, 1884, pp. 585-599), that there is no real difference between the two tenses. Bl. examines Demosthenes XLVII 5 ff., XXIX 11 ff. and arrives at the following results: (1) In the case of offers, where the answer of the opponent is expected, the infinitive of the incomplete action is used to express actions for which one offers himself, as the completion cannot be taken into consideration before the consent of the opponent is obtained. (2) The forms of incomplete action, inclusive of present indic., express not only a conative action, but also the action with reference to its quality and motives; the aorist expresses only completion and result. (3) A number of verbs expressing actions which have their aim and completion in the action of another, may, in

<sup>1</sup> See A. J. P. X 365.

a large measure, be treated as imperfects, i. e. may be put in the imperfect instead of in the aorist, as soon as this incompleteness and dependence on the completing action of another is emphasized. Such verbs are *κελεύειν*, *ἀξιοῦν*, *παρακελεύεσθαι*, *ἔρωτᾶν*, *λέγειν*, *πέμπειν*, *ἀποστέλλειν*, etc. (4) The imperfect is also used of verbs of independent meaning to emphasize the fact that this action is not lasting and definite, but only inceptive and lasting up to a certain point. (5) If the modality of an action, i. e. the particular circumstances of its completion, is expressed by a separate verb the imperfect is used. Bl. then discusses the following verbs, presenting usually some difficulties, e. g. *ἐκέλευον* and *ἐκέλευσα*, *καλεῖν* and *καλέσαι*, *ἀνάβηθι* and *ἀνάβητε*, *μαρτύρησον*, *ἀκούσατε*, *λαβέ* (*τὴν μαρτυρίαν*), *ἀναγίγνωσκε*, *ἀνάγνωθι* and *λέγε*.

Pp. 25-51. In his notes on the Latin grammarians L. Jeep discusses the relation of the 'Excerpta codicis Bobiensis' to the Grammar of Dositheus. In certain portions they agree admirably, and a study of the chapter on the noun shows that the differences are not so great as has been believed, consisting as they do either in lacunae in Dositheus or interpolations in the Excerpta; also mistakes of the scribes result in divergencies. The traditional readings of the Excerpta represent another class of MSS than the Codex Sangallensis of the grammar of Dositheus. The similarity between the Excerpta and Charisius points to a common source which was wilfully changed by the latter. It is, however, not to be identified with the grammar of Dositheus, but with a book compiled from the grammar of Dositheus and another. Diomedes made use of Charisius and at the same time of the source common to Charisius and the Excerpta.

Pp. 52-64. S. Sudhaus dates the Euthydemus between 388-87: (1) because of the graphic description of Isocrates in 305 D; and (2) because the Panegyricus of the latter was not yet published. The Gorgias is directed against Isocrates, and shows that philosophy, not political rhetoric, is the true calling of a man, is true virtue. Callicles is the representative of Isocrates, and *πλεονεξία* and *πείθειν* are attacked by Socrates as vehemently as they are defended by Isocrates in *Πρὸς Νικοκλέα* (377 B. C.); cf. especially §48 and Gorg. 500, and §39 and Gorg. 486 C. Isocrates defends himself against this attack in his *Νικοκλής* (375 B. C.); consequently the Gorgias was composed about 376 B. C. Isocrates XV 250 and 259-269 corresponds almost literally to Panath. 26 and is directed against Plato. Isocrates will deal more leniently with Plato than he has been dealt with by the latter (in Rep. VI 500 B.) Thus follows that this latest portion of the Republic was published before 354 B. C.

Pp. 65-103. O. Rossbach's article on the manuscript tradition of the Periochae of Livius is based on a collation of the two MSS Cod. Pal. Lat. 894 N (azarianus) in Heidelberg, and Cod. Lat. 7701 (P) of the Paris Nat. Library, formerly belonging to Claudius Puteanus. P, though inferior to N, goes back to the same archetypal codex, of which N, however, is not a direct copy. Very similar to it, yet not the same, as Jahn thought, was the MS, the collation of which P. Pithou (1539-1596) inserted into his copy of the second edition of Livy by Sigonio, now in the Bodleian Library; it may have been an apograph of N, dating earlier than the renaissance, since the MS does not show the interpolations characteristic of the fourteenth and fifteenth cen-

turies; the careful orthography points to the twelfth. The readings of N and P, differing from Jahn's edition, are given, together with critical remarks and emendations of corrupt passages.

Pp. 104-126, 161-193. E. Schwartz examines the discrepancies between Xenophon and Lysias in respect to Theramenes and the Agoratus conspiracy. The account of the events from the battle at Aegospotami to the rule of the thirty at Athens, given by Xenophon in *Hellenica* II 2, 10-3, 11, is short, yet to the point and consistent, II 3, 3. Of course we have to change *Δεκελείας* into *Ἀκαδημείας* (cf. 2, 8). Lysias' account (in his c. Eratosth. and Agor.) is that of a partisan misrepresenting the facts. The contradictions between Lysias and Xenophon are of such a nature that the orator for the most part deserves less credit. It is to be regretted that Xenophon is silent on many points of the greatest importance. To explain this we have to study the personal element in Xenophon, which predominates throughout the *Hellenica*. Such a study will yield a number of data for his biography. Schwartz examines Xenophon's share in the expedition of Thrasyllus and his military service under the rule of the thirty. I 2, 1-10; ib. 9 we have a lacuna between *πόλεως* and *ἐβοήθησαν*, and at the end of the same paragraph read *Σελινοῖσι* < *οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν* > *δνοῖν*; I 3, 9 dele *Καλχηδονίους*. Books V-VII show the desire of the author to enlighten the Athenians on the mild and friendly behavior of the Lacedaemonians as contrasted with that of the Thebans. The same blending of the man and the teacher pervades the first four books, establishes the essential unity of the whole work, and proves that it was not written at different periods, but was composed at Corinth, about the year 369 B. C., without interruption from other literary work.

Pp. 127-150, 240-258. A. Gercke. Alexandrian studies. Continued from XLII 626 (A. J. P. X 245). The quarrel with Apollonius. Among the Alexandrian poets Callimachus was especially opposed to cyclic poetry; cf. Ep. 28, 1, *ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθω* | *χαίρω τίς πολλοὺς ὥδε καὶ ὥδε φέρει*; also Call. II 107 ff., Theocr. 7, 45 ff. Theocritus, even more than Callimachus, wrote with a definite intention to satirize Apollonius' epic poetry. In the criticism of Callimachus we meet, for the first time in ancient poetry, with a poet repeating the words of his adversary with the purpose of satirizing and injuring him. The feud ended with the Ibis of Callimachus. Apollonius shows independence and great learning in his *Argonautica*, which he composed while yet a youth. A later insertion of many portions of the poem cannot be proved. The chief objection to Apollonius is that he lacks poetic unity in his writings. It is very likely that all his later works were composed at a time when Apollonius was ridiculed on all sides. An interesting delineation of the contrast in character and erudition of Apollonius and his adversaries Callimachus and Theocritus, and of the traits common to them, together with some chronological results, closes the article.

Pp. 151-160. C. Wachsmuth accepts Crusius' interpretation of the second acrostic of Dionysius Periegetes, ll. 513-532, against Unger (A. J. P. IX 373 and X 373); of the first acrostic (ll. 109-129 according to their discoverer, Leue) ll. 109-111 do not belong to the acrostic; ll. 112-129 give the author's name: *Διονυσίου τῶν ἐντὸς Φάρου* (= τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως).—The *κύκλοι* of Demon,

mentioned by Hesychius and Zenobius V 20, are the γῦροι or circular trenches round the vines and olive trees. This explains, according to Wachsmuth, the name of the Attic torrent Κυκλοβόρος in the deme Oenoë as the destroyer of such trenches.—J. E. Kirchner gives sufficient proof that the strategy of Cleon, mentioned in Ar. Clouds 581 ff., refers to the year 424–423 B. C.—The Byzantine and modern Greek νυμφίτσα, weasel, leads Th. Zielinski to the conjecture that one word for weasel in classic Greek may have been νύμφη, and hence arose the legend of the weasel as a bride.<sup>1</sup>—F. Schöll raises objections against Vahlen's theory of the chronology of the Annals of Ennius. Varro ap. Gell. XVII 21, 42 must refer to the last book of the annals, as Cic. pro Archia IX 22 and Plaut. Truc. 929 prove that the first six books had been published before 284 B. C.; also books VII–XII must date earlier than 272 B. C.

Pp. 194–206. A. Ludwich. Johannes of Gaza flourished under the Emperor Anastasius I (491–518 A. D.), before Paulus Silentiarius, and not later, as E. Abel, in his edition of the ἑκφρασις, is inclined to believe. This ἑκφρασις τοῦ κοσμικοῦ πίνακος was delivered—not at Antioch, as Petersen and others maintained—but at Gaza, where we also find the picture which gave rise to the poem.

Pp. 207–239. J. Ilberg. On the writings of Claudius Galenus of Pergamum. I. Biographical and chronological arrangement of his works. Galen was a very prolific writer (Athen. I 1 e). The books περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων πρὸς Εὐγενιανόν, περὶ τῶν ἰδίων βιβλίων γραφή, the catalogues appended to several of his works, especially to the τέχνη ἰατρική, and many quotations from his own writings help us to an approximate date of his works. The author began with studies in philosophy, anatomy, and physiology; in later years he devoted his attention more to the practical subjects of pathology and therapeutics. The works written under Commodus (180–192 A. D.) must have been destroyed in the great fire, ἐν ᾗ τὸ τῆς Εἰρήνης τέμενος ἅμα καὶ πολλοῖς ἄλλοις ἐκαύθη (XIX 19). This accounts for the fact that none of the extant works can be assigned to this period.

Pp. 259–266. L. von Ulrichs. Pliny, praef. 26, Apelles faciebat aut Polyclitus is ἐποίει as well as ἐποίησεν, while fecit in §27 is equal to πεποίηκεν. Pliny alluded to three instances without going into details; these are supplied by Paus. VI 4, 5; 14, 5, and 16, 5. Against Furtwängler (Fleckeis. Jahrb., 1876, p. 509), Overbeck, and others, the traditional reading of 34, 59, vicit eum—sagittis configi, is defended.

Pp. 267–272. Years ago A. von Gutschmid sent his copy of Georgius Syncellus to H. Gelzer. Every page was covered with corrections and emendations by the learned historian. Gelzer publishes now the corrected list of the Egyptian kings by Eratosthenes contained in Georg. Syncell., pp. 171, 3; 180, 7; 190, 6; 195, 6; 204, 19; 233, 5, and 278, 22. Every correction shows anew the great critical genius of the late Gutschmid.

Pp. 273–279. E. Klebs. A sober examination of Plin. Ep. II 1–6 proves that the princes mentioned is always the same, viz. Nerva (cf. §5); Asbach

<sup>1</sup> Zielinski ought to have considered Ar. Ach. 255.—B. L. G.

(*Analecta historica et epigraphica latina*, p. 16 ff.) is therefore wrong in assigning the consulate year of Tacitus to 98 A. D. instead of 97.

Pp. 280-285. F. Schöll. Terentii Adelphi, l. 117, read *scortatur* instead of *obsonat*, and omit ll. 118 and 119; l. 199, read *domo mi eripuit* against Sauppe's *domi me arripuit*; l. 162 f., omit, with Klette, *hanc—esse*, and read *tu quod te posterius purges, huius non faciam. crede < mi > hoc, Ego meum ius persequar*; ll. 217-8, omit *atque adulescenti esses morigeratus*, and put l. 219a before 218b; other conjectural omissions and interpolations are found in l. 264 and l. 267; Prolog. 4 ff., read *indicio < falso factam ex vetere quom arguunt: index > . . .*; between ll. 224-225 insert *Dum cum ero, leno, litis facias: aliquid saltem tu auferas*.

Pp. 286-298. P. Krumbholz. The repetitions in Diodorus are intentional and the work of the author, and not due to later corruption and interpolations, as Schneider, *dē Diod., lib. I-IV font.* Berol. 1880, supposes. Several repetitions on Arabia, Assyria, and the *Τανδαρίδαι* are discussed.

Pp. 299-304. O. Immisch. The *νεῖκος Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ Πηλεΐδew Ἀχιλλῆος* referred to in Od. VIII 73-82 was narrated in the Cypria. This quarrel of the two heroes took place at the time when the Greek fleet was at Delos with King Anius, and dates, therefore, earlier than the events recorded in the Iliad.

Pp. 305-320. M. Schanz reads, Soph. O. R. 1267, *δῆν* (= *δὴ ἦν*) instead of *δ' ἦν* (= *δὲ ἦν*).—O. Ribbeck defends his view of the Characters of Theophrastus against H. v. Gomperz; he maintains, with Jebb, three distinct revisions or editions of the text. Gomperz sends an answer to this defence, on pp. 472-3, and R. adds a final reply on pp. 473-4.—H. Weber, in a note on the death of Pheidias, reads Philochorus ap. Schol. on Ar. Pax 605, *τοῦτο δὲ ἐξεργασάμενος ἀποθανεῖν λέγεται ὑπὸ εἰλεῶν* (or perhaps even *εἰλειῶν*) for *Ἡλείων*; the *εἰλεῶς* was a grievous disease of the intestines.—O. Crusius. The *κυνὸς αὐτοφωνία* of Oenomaus is to be explained on the analogy of *αὐτόφωνος* as sayings from the dog's own lips.—W. H. Roscher. The form *ἐνδεδιωκότα*, on the latter half of the first tablet of Heracleia, CIG. III, p. 700, l. 95, is equal to Attic *ἐμβεβιωκότα*; *ἐνδιῶν* is the Doric equivalent for Attic *ἐμβιοῖν*, and therefore means 'having taken root'; cf. Doric *ὀδελός* = Attic *ὀβελός*, Doric *δῆλομαι* = *βέλλομαι* = *βόλλομαι*. Doric *δίω*, phonetically, stands between *ζάω* = *διάω*, cf. *διαίτα* and *βιώω*.—G. Kaibel. The Tau Gallicum in the epigramma catalepton, Verg. II 4, refers to the cruelty of Annius Cimber.—F. B. On Iullus (not Iulus) in Hor. Od. IV 2 and the writings attributed to him; ll. 33 and 41, read 'concines' *maiore poeta plectro*. This and the lordly sacrifice mentioned at the end of the ode refer to this Iullus as an epic poet.—H. J. Müller reads, Seneca rhetor, contr. I 1, 3, *qui illum vidit, quid timendum felicibus putat! < qui te, > quid desperandum infelicibus*, and X 2, 1 *maiorum quoque suorum < gloriam > et virtutes referebat*.—H. B. Darbishire emends Tac. Annales I 32, *prostratos verberibus mulcant sexagenis* (for *sexageni*) *singulos*. Wölfflin, on p. 488, adds that this emendation had been made by several writers before D.—C. Wachsmuth reprints a Latin hendecasyllabic inscription found in Athens by Kumanudis and published in *Ἐφημ. ἀρχ.*, 1887, col. 218. It is a eulogy on an illustrious Roman citizen under the Flavian Emperors.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOLOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. Jahrgang 1889.

Fascicle I.

I. Indogermanische Mythen. II. Achilleis. E. H. Meyer, Berlin, 1887; viii and 710 pp. Review by W. Schwartz, Berlin. This volume is a supplement to and largely an outgrowth of the author's *Gandharven-Kentauren* (1883), and is the result of investigations rich in material. Its method proceeds upon an examination of the material contained in Homer, then of that furnished otherwise, a comparison of these with each other, the determining of the popular form of the myth, and finally an account of similar myths among kindred peoples. Its purpose is to establish the original nucleus of the myth, and thus the origin of the whole tradition. This is the true method for any tradition within the historic period, but not sound in case of prehistoric tradition, which requires a truly inductive method that rests upon a certain homogeneity in the elements and aspects of a myth, and seeks to demonstrate, by proper grouping, etc., a process of evolution.

The author wastes space and time on the "idea of an Achilles"; he introduces with it a new problem into his work, and gives it too much of a speculative character; 404 pages are thus consumed. The book reaches the conclusion that Achilles personifies the lightning. Yet it is a question whether mythology has to do with personifications of natural phenomena, partaking of a quasi-abstract character, rather than with an animated world of nature, whose characters were conceived of as realities in an age of superstition. Man needed and invented such characters to explain for him the otherwise incomprehensible phenomena which beset him whether awake or asleep. It is in such conceptions of an enchanted, supernatural world, leading to the invention of such creations, that it seems possible to trace the origin of mythical and religious beliefs.

2. *Παιπαλόμεναι*. F. Vollbrecht, Hannover. The author seeks by starting from the strictly literal sense of *πάλλω* (from which *παιπαλόμεναι* seems to be a derivative) to classify the meanings of this vexatious adjective under two heads: (1) as active, (2) as passive. In its active sense it occurs as an epithet of islands, viz. Imbros, Samos, Chios, Ithaca; in its passive sense as an epithet of localities, e. g. *ὄρος, σκοπή, Μίμας, Κύνθος, ὁδός, ἀταρπός*. V. seeks to establish its active sense by starting from its use with Ithaca, since this island is so well described in Homer that we are spared the blunder of a rendering of *παιπαλόμεναι* incompatible with the description of the island. By numerous citations (Od. IX 20, XIII 242 et al.) V. throws discredit on its rendering "craggy," "mountainous," notes that in all places where it is used of islands, the poet conceives of motion towards the island, and says, "any one standing in a boat which is rocking on the waves will notice that it is very easy to transfer the motion of the boat to the objects which he may see standing out from the water; and if he is like the Greeks, who had a predilection for judging by appearances, he will say that the *island* swings or rocks itself." To prove that this transfer is Homeric, V. quotes Od. XV 299, *ἐνθεν δ' αὖ νήσοισι ἐπιπρόεηκε θοῆσι*, where *θοῆσι*, elsewhere used of ships, is used of islands. The passive sense of *παιπαλόμεναι* is illustrated in its use, e. g. with *ὄρος*, the mountain being that which causes the climber to swing and sway as he ascends its precipitous sides; this swinging or swaying is then transferred to the mountain (cf. the

similar use of *dizzy* in English). The article concludes with an excursus on II. XII 167-172.

3. Ad Hipponactis Fragmenta. A note on frag. 85 (Bergk) by O. Immisch, Leipzig.

4. Zu den epischen fragmenten der Griechen. A note on Kinkel's edition of Lykophron (Leipzig, 1880), by Max Schneider, Gotha.

5. Der thesaurus der Egestaier auf dem Eryx und der bericht des Thukydides. W. H. Roscher, Wurzen. On Thuk. VI 46: *ἀ δὲ οὐτα ἀργυρᾶ πολλῶ πλείω τὴν ὀψιν ἀπ' ὀλίγης δυνάμεως χρημάτων παρείχετο*. The difficulty of this passage was first noted by Meineke (Hermes III 372). How, if the good people of Egesta displayed vast stores of actual silver to the Athenian envoys, can Thuk. say that they *ἐξετεχνήσαντο* any deception with which to delude them? That verb seems to imply that they managed the silver in some shrewd way; how then may we change *ἀργυρᾶ* so as to avoid inconsistency and make it clear that the people of Egesta were cunning, but also that the envoys were not so completely deceived as to imply that they had no understanding? By reading *ἐπαργυρᾶ* for *ἀργυρᾶ*, says Meineke, and with him Stahl agrees. Against this, Roscher offers four objections and proposes *ὑπαργυρᾶ*, implying silver beneath a surface or layer of gold. He offers arguments in conclusion as to good Attic use of this word in this sense.

6. Observationes criticae in Polyaei Strategemata, by F. Reuss.

7. A note on Plutarch's Eumenes, by Max Schneider, Gotha, in connection with the name *Βασιώνη* in Pape's Wörterbuch der griechischen eigennamen.

8. Zur erklärang der Arvalakten. J. Weisweiler, Köln. On the sense and syntactical use of Latin verbals in *-ndus*. *Adolendae, commolendae, deferendae, coinquendae* are discussed, as they appear in the Arval acts of the years 183 and 224 (C. I. L. VI 1, pp. 559-571). In the second of these are used the abbreviations *adolend., coinq.*, which W. holds to be dat. pl. His conclusion is that these quoted words are the future passive participles of the verbs which describe the necessary procedure in the removing of trees. They give the requisite description of those tree-deities which are thus named and designated as "to be removed" or "to be destroyed."

9. Zu Cicero's Laelius. K. Schliack, Cottbus. Critical notes on §§37 and 41. In §37 S. would read *a Tuberone Aelio aliisque amicis*. In §41 he rewrites the sentences in different order.

10. Die Alamannenschlacht bei Straszburg. H. Hecker. In support of W. Wiegand's Die Alamannenschlacht vor Straszburg, and against H. Nissen (Westdeutscher Zeitschrift VI 320 ff.)

11. Zu Horatius Epoden. O. Keller, Prag. On his edition of Horace, epode 17, 1. He now proposes to read *iamiam* instead of *iam iam*, for a rather unsatisfactory reason.

Fascicles 2 and 3.

12. Alexander Reichardt, in the leading article, of which he promises a continuation, treats exhaustively the forms found in the Annals of Ennius, "which were in later times lost from common use." These have not before been separately and carefully treated. Lucian Müller notices many such

forms, but follows a different plan. Reichardt aims "to explain those forms which in the Annals, in words and lines, seem to be peculiar to Ennius himself or to his period." His order of treatment is: (a) words not adopted into later literature, (b) those words which are employed by Ennius in some special sense, (c) word-forms foreign to the usage of later times. His subdivision is the natural one of substantives, adjectives, verbs, etc. Especially interesting are the examples cited under (b): in Ann. v. 237 and v. 419 occurs *quadrupes eques* in the sense of *quadrupes equus*. In support of the retention of the reading *eques* R. quotes Gellius, who heard from Antonius Julianus, rhetorician: *pleraque veterum aetas et hominem equo insidentem et equum, qui insideretur equitem dixerunt*; also the very old edition of Lampadio, in which *equitare* is derived from *eques*, 'both the man using the horse, and the horse stepping beneath the man,' being denoted by the word. It is claimed by two grammarians that Vergil once (Georg. III 116) imitated Ennius in the use of *equitem* for *equum*. The form of the pronoun of the third person (vv. 102 and 165), *sam* for *eam*, *sos* for *eos*, are noted as very ancient forms, even for Ennius. The prep. *endo*, *indu* (Müller rejects *indo*) for *in* are of such rare occurrence that "we know these longer forms, already in the time of Ennius, not to have been of frequent use in common speech."

13. E. Bussler, Greifswald, compares the "Excerpta ex Timothei Gazaei libris de animalibus" with Oppianos Kynetikos, and finds that both have probably drawn from the same source, some learned naturalist. Oppian adorned his matter with poetic embellishment; Timotheus diligently stripped off everything superfluous, with evident effort to specialize rather than generalize.

14. Zu den Ilias scholien. A. Ludwig, Königsberg. In this article Ludwig publishes a communication from Adolf Torstrik on the parchment codex Matritensis LXXI, with a comparison of Scorialensis γ I 1 and Ω I 12. His conclusion is that this collection of Escorial scholia shows strong likenesses to the so-called Didymos scholia (D)—enough for further research.

15. Polybii historiae, recensuit apparatu critico instruxit F. Hultsch. Vol. I editio altera. Berolini apud Weidmannos. lxxiii and 339 pp. An exhaustive review of this edition of Hultsch by Büttner-Wobst, devoted mainly to an enumeration of the passages in which H. in this second edition deviates from the first, and to a discussion of those passages wherein he maintains his own view against the understanding of others.

16. Rottenabstände in der phalanx und der manipular legion und die größe der interalle. F. Giesing, Dresden. A discussion of Polyb. XVIII 29 ff., a passage misunderstood by Rüstow and Köchly, and rejected by H. Delbrück (Hermes XXI 83 ff.) as corrupt. Giesing holds (1) that the distance from man to man in the *phalanx* was  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ft.; (2) in the *acies* there are two arrangements to be distinguished from each other even after the march to position, (a) the position in readiness for action, with intervals for the advance and retreat of the light-armed, (b) the actual position in action; (3) the interval in the *acies* for (a) is  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ft., for (b) 3 ft.; (4) the intervals in the start gave to each man a space of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ft., while in the second position each man had  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ft. more than in the first; the total of the intervals therefore corresponds to one-half the length of the front line at the first position, or one-third of it at the second.

17. Critical note on Thuk. VII 75, 4, proposing for ἀνεν ὀλίγων the reading ἀνεν λεγέων, by H. Kothe, Breslau.

18. Zu Caesar de bello civili. A. E. Schoene. On I 3, 3, after *completur* he reads *turbulētius* (*turbulentius*) for *urbs et ius*.

19. Zu Plautus. A. E. Anspach, J. Lange, E. Redslob. Critical notes on Rudens, Mercator, Truculentus, Poenulus.

20. Studien zu den Griechischen Ortsnamen, von Dr. L. Grasberger. 1888. ix und 391 S. Review by C. Angermann, who says "it is unfortunately evident that the work reviewed does not belong to those which bring credit to German thoroughness." The number of typographical errors is large, and the register not copious enough; since, also, the book deals so largely with Greek names, there certainly should have been a respectable Greek index, a thing which the book does not have.

21. Caesar's zweiter zug nach Britannien. J. Lange. A study on B. G. V 8-19, leading to the result that Lange suggests the chapters be read in this order: 8, 12, 13, 14, 9, 10, 11, 18, 15, 16, 17, 19. The argument is altogether esoteric, and is based upon no discussion of folios.

22. Zu Ciceros Pompeiana. A. Deuerling. The article is on §18; for *postea victoria recuperare* it proposes *nostra victoria recuperare*, on the strength of a strikingly similar passage in Cic. in Verrem II, §86.

23. Zu Manilius. Original and critical studies by Th. Breiter, Hannover. The article covers 14 pages and a continuation is promised.

24. Zu Ciceros rede für den dichter Archias. K. Koch, Düsseldorf. Some very sensible emendations on §§5, 9, 10. For *iam absentibus notus*, §5, he proposes *iam absens nobis*.

25. Cn. Flavius und das weihungsjahr seines Concordiatempels. L. Triemel, Kreutznach. This places the year of dedication in the Varronian year 451, and shows incidentally that Livy in his account in Bk. IX 46, as is so often the case with Diodoros, has narrated the events of several years under the one year 450. To the same year 451 belongs also the administration of the censor Q. Fabius, of whom Livy makes mention at the conclusion of the chapter.

26. Das datum des Pannonischen triumphes des Tiberius. K. Schrader, Düren. This article begins with a statement of the authorities at hand for determining this date, and of the various results different scholars have reached in employing them. Most recently H. Schulz, pp. 15-24, *quaestiones Ovidianae* (Greifswald, 1883), has settled on the year 13, in which the triumph was celebrated, and has won Mommsen to his view, who has (C. I. L. I 384 and R. St. R. I<sup>2</sup>, p. 133, note 2) declared in favor of the year 13. Schrader combats both critics, and argues for the 16th of January, 12 A. D. He would therefore read in Velleius II 104, 3, *per annos continuos VIII* instead of *per . . . VIII*.

27. Zu Cicero de officiis. A critical note on III 1, by K. Schliack, Cottbus, favoring the omission of *interdum*.

#### Fascicle 4.

28. Zur geschichte und composition der Ilias. VII. K. Brandt. The original form of the *μηνις* has been asserted by B. to be "A 1-348, lücke, β 42-H 312, kleinere lücke, β 1-41, A 1 ff." He now defends his position, against

the criticism of Rothe, by showing that the contradictions detected by R. in B.'s *μηρίς* are only apparent, and of precisely the nature to induce the tasteless later editor to attempt to remove them. B. then takes up in detail the description of the arming of Achilles and his entrance into the battle. By a minute analysis he shows that T 42-356, and 34-36 (*εις—μάλα*) are by a later hand, the author of I.

29. Zu Tacitus. F. Walter. Textual notes on Hist. I 71 and IV 23, and Ann. XI 35 and XV 58.

30. Zur Homerischen frage. C. Rothe. A reply to the criticisms of Brandt (Jahrb. 1888, 513). R. advises B. "genauer zu lesen und zuzusehen was die wirkliche ansicht des gegners und seine gründe sind."

31. Oileus und Ileus. A. Ludwich. L. calls attention to the fact that some ancient authorities give the name of Ileus to the father of the Lokrian Aias, reading, for example, in β 527, for *Οἰλῆος*, δ' *Ἰλῆος*.

32. Zu Sophokles Elektra. F. Weck. 466 f. translate "ich werde es thun: denn das hat keinen rechten sinn, gegen (euch) zwei (die schwester und den chor) anzukämpfen, wohl aber (hat es rechten sinn) die that zu beschleunigen." 1485 f. translate "denn inwiefern könnte, wenn sterbliche sich in schlechtheiten eingelassen haben, dass sie sterben müssen, die zukünftige (dh. hier ein längeres warten) von nutzen sein."

33. Das neue Wiener fragment des Epicharmos. F. Blass. B. agrees with Gomperz that the recently discovered fragment of ten lines is from the *Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀντόμολος* of Epicharmos, but his interpretation of it differs from G.'s.

(17). Zu Thukydides. H. v. Kleist. II 89, 5, for *ἀξιον* read *ἀντάξιον*. II 89, 9, *τά τε παραγγελλόμενα*, omit *τε*, and take *παρὰ ταῖς τε ναυσὶ μένοντες* together, as contrasted with *καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ*. II 87, 3, translate *τὸ μὲν κατὰ κράτος νικῆέν* "das dem obsiegen, dh. dem äuszern erfolge nach überwundene."

34. Die bezeichnung des reciproken verhältnisses bei Caesar. R. Menge, Halle. The conclusions reached at the end of this discussion are: I. Those are strictly reciprocal relations wherein there is contained a reciprocity between parts (a) of the subject, (b) of the object. II. This reciprocity lies either in the relation of objects to one another, or in an adverbial relation. III. From lack of a reciprocal pronoun, the Latins handled the reciprocal relation as follows: (1) by leaving the relation unexpressed, if it was readily understood from the context; (2) by employing the following devices: (a) the repeating of a pronoun, especially *alter, alius, uterque, omnis, quisque*; (b) by (rarely) repeating a substantive, not only when there are two, but even more objects of reciprocity; (c) by repeating the substantive modified by *uterque*; (d) by the use of *uterque alterum, neuter alterum*; (e) frequently by the use of *inter se* (*nos, eos, ipsos*) employed of two or more objects of reciprocity; (f) *uterque inter se, ipsi inter se*; (g) *se*, when there is no confusion in the reciprocity, and the subject is emphasized by *ipse*.

35. Zu Ciceros Reden. Th. Matthias, Zittau. This has very much the nature of an independent supplement to Schöll's Interpolationen, lücken und sonstige verderbnisse in Ciceros rede *de domo sua* (Rhein. Mus. XLIII 419 ff.) The article is a discussion of five cases of interpolations, three of lacunae, and six of other corrupt passages.

36. Zu Caesars bellum gallicum. H. Deiter, Aurich. I, on V 19, 3, D. places the *in* before *agris* later in the sentence, viz. after *quantum*. II, on VII 64, 1, read *itemque* for *diemque*.

37. A careful critical study of Cicero's Topica, by W. Friedrich, Mühlhausen.

Fascicle 5.

38. Diodors verhältniss zum Stoicismus. G. Busolt. Diodoros shows in many places the influence of the Stoic philosophy, especially of Posidonios, though his special interest is in the ethical and religious doctrines. But he has no hesitation in bringing forward the Epikurean theories of the universe.

(4). Zu den epischen fragmenten der Griechen. R. Peppmüller. A brief note.

39. Theokritos von Chios. F. Schröder. A biographical sketch of the bucolic poet, Theokritos of Chios, who lived at about the same time as his more famous namesake of Syracuse.

40. Zu Hypereides. H. Meuss. A brief textual note.

41. Ein beitrage zur kenntniss des volkstümlichen rechnens bei den Römern. F. Hultsch. H. treats of the expressions "*partes centum dicere*" in Petronius, and "*assem in centum partes diducere*" in Horace. These have both the same meaning, and probably have to do with the reckoning of interest.

42. Zu Archilochos. E. Hiller. A textual note on fragment 32.

43. Diodors bericht über die censur des Appius Claudius Caecus: ein beitrage zur zeitrechnung des Fabius und Piso. L. Triemel, Kreuznach. The peculiarity of the time-reckoning of Diodorus is due to the fact that he intended to follow the Catonian system, but employed Piso as his authority, who followed the Fabian system. So true is this that even in the lists of fasti Diodoros deviates from the Catonian to the Fabian system. This deviation commences with the beginning of D.'s history of Rome, from the 11th book on, where the consulship of Virginus and Cassius is placed in ol. 75, 1; all the following years are dated—as far as the end of the 12th book—ol. 91, 1, following Fabius. But with book 13 D. begins with the Catonian reckoning, in order to bring the battle at the Allia, as Polybios does, in ol. 98, 2. To do this he leaves out five terms of magistrates, but brings them in after the battle, so as to agree with his authority, which reckons according to Fabius. Finally, in order to give the Catonian date of the first plebeian consulate, he was obliged to reduce to three years the preceding interregnum, which is given as four years by Piso and Fabius. After the first plebeian consulate D. gives the Catonian lists of fasti, and with Cato holds to the consuls of 447, 448, rejected by Fabius, and comes in this way into contradiction with his own narrative, which follows the Fabian reckoning of Piso.

44. Die abfassungszeit der Plautinischen Bacchides. A. E. Anspach, Cleve. Anspach decides for the year 187.

45. Vergilius und Timaios. H. Kothe, Breslau. If Vergil made use of Timaios, a thing not impossible, he so disposed of his material that there now remain but very faint traces of such use.

46. Zu Juvenalis. C. Häberlin, Halle. In Sat. XII 55 read *ac se explicat angusto*.

47. Der bericht des Florus über die Varusschlacht. F. Knoke. Ranke (Weltgesch. III 25) gives credit to the story that the Roman camp in its condition of rest was attacked at a moment when Varus sat on his tribunal in judgment; but Mommsen ridicules this latter statement. The article analyses the evidence of Tacitus and Cassius Dion, and concludes that the words of Florus (itaque improvidum et nihil tale metuentem ex improviso adorti, cum ille—o securitas—ad tribunal citaret, undique invadunt) cannot be taken as Ranke understands them so literally. Florus is also in agreement with other authorities on the march of Varus through the Teutoburg forest.

48. Zu Sallustius. A. Kunze, Planen. Justification of *cum* in *cum infestis signis*, Cat. 60, 2.

Fascicle 6.

49. Variae lectionis specimen primum. I-XL. H. Usener. An interesting series of critical discussions, on both Greek and Roman writers, covering 19 pages.

50. Zum Homerischen Selenehymnos. W. H. Roscher. In v. 6, for ἐνδίαογται read ἐνδαίονται.

51. Zu Platons Kriton. C. Häberlin. In 49a, for τηλικοῖδε γέροντες ἄνδρες, read τηλικοῖδε γ' ὄντες ἄνδρες.

52. Des Protagoras satz über das masz aller dinge. P. Seliger. H. Heussler, in a review of the 14th edition of Schwegler's History of Philosophy (Zs. f. Phil. u. Phil. Krit. XCII, heft 1), has asserted that the famous dictum of Protagoras, πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπον εἶναι, τῶν μὲν ὄντων, ὥς ἐστι, τῶν δὲ μὴ ὄντων, ὥς οὐκ ἐστιν, has been misinterpreted from the time of Plato until to-day. H. held that the subject of ἐστι(ν) in both cases is not χρήματα, but ἄνθρωπος, and translates the sentence "aller dinge maszstab ist der mensch, der seienden, wie er ist, der nichtseienden, wie er nicht ist." Seliger overthrows this opinion by a thorough discussion of all the authorities, not only Plato, but also Cicero, Sextos Empeirikos, Laertios Diogenes, Aristokles, and Hermias.

53. Zum Homerischen Hermes hymnos. A. Ludwig. Five textual emendations.

54. Die bedeutung der Regulusode des Horatius. A. Teuber, Eberswald. On the fifth ode of the third book, proceeding to discuss, first, the analysis of it made by Kiessling, which Teuber declares to be far from correct. The ode is then analyzed and interpreted as T. understands it.

55. De Phaedri Senario. H. Draheim, Berlin. An investigation of the fact that Phaedrus wrote verse in accordance with the law that no accented penult of a word of more than two syllables is admitted into the thesis of the second, fourth, and sixth feet. Draheim has discussed this law in reference to the iambics of Terence in Hermes XV 238.

56. Zu Florus. K. Schrader, Düren. On II 34, *dictator perpetuus et pater patriae*. For the first word Mommsen reads *dictus imperator*. S. reads the five words as they stand, and supplies in translation *dictus* after *patriae*.

E. B. CLAPP.

W. E. WATERS.

## PHILOLOGUS, XLVII.

## Heft 1.

## I.—TREATISES.

I. Pp. 1-12. Concerning the history of ancient metric. W. Hoerschelmann discusses the *διαφοραί* of the hexameter and the various versions in which they have been handed down.

II. Pp. 13-24. On the Homeric hymns. R. Peppmüller proposes emendations in 8 verses of the hymn to Aphrodite, and 4 in the lesser hymns.

Pp. 24 and 52. Emendationum ad Dionem Chrysostomum Specimen (I, II).

III. Pp. 25-32. A reform of Aristophanes. Th. Zielinski. The comic poet, imitating Euripides, made the *agon* the theatre for *γνώμαι* and *γνωμῖδια* instead of for *λοιδορίαι*. This is what is meant by Cratinus's reproach, preserved by an old grammarian:

τίς δὲ σὺ ; κομψὸς < πᾶς ἄν > τις ἔροιτο θεατῆς·  
ὑπολεπτολόγος, γνωμιδιώκτης, εὐριπιδαριστοφανίζων.

We get an idea of the Cratinean *agon* in the *Knights*, where Aristophanes returned to the old fashion. In other plays the Cratinean *ἄγων λοιδορῶν* is transferred to the *proagon*. The character of the pre-Cratinean *agon* may be inferred from the parabasis of the *Lysistrata*. Imagine (as to the matter) the *γνώμαι*, and (as to the form) the *ἀγωνισταί* eliminated from the *agon*, and this somewhat reduced in extent, and we have the parabasis of the *Lysistrata*.

IV. Pp. 32-44. Coniectanea ad Comoediae antiquae fragmenta. O. Crusius offers conjectures with regard to the restoration or interpretation of numerous fragments of Cratinus, Crates, and Pherecrates.

P. 44. Ad inscriptiones Phrygiae notulae. O. Crusius vs. W. Ramsay.

V. Pp. 45-52. A contribution to Vulgar-Latin. O. Weise. Not only does the Latin of the street show many Greek idioms, but it has also a special fondness for hybrid formations, fastening Greek suffixes on to Latin words, or making compounds out of two heterogeneous elements. Plautus affords many examples, sometimes joining Greek patronymic suffixes to Latin names, as *Tedigniloquides*, *Numquampostreddonides*, etc.; sometimes Latinizing the ending, as in *cruricrepida*, *plagipatida*, *rapacida*, etc. Like *στρατιώτης* and similar forms he makes *hamiota* from *hamus*; *navita* must be regarded, too, as developed out of *nauta*, itself simply a borrowed form of *ναύτης*, under the influence of *navis*. So Plautus uses a number of compounds made on the model of the Greek, but which have no real existence in that language, as *tragicomoedia*, *hapalopsis*, *pentethronicus*, etc. In the authors succeeding Plautus but few such formations are found. Cato has *apiacon* and *scutriscum*, if this latter word can be regarded as a diminutive of *scutra*. Cicero shows once (ad Att. I 16, 13) *facteon* = *ποιητέον*. After Vitruvius these hybrid formations become quite frequent and give rise to several classes of endings that are still very vital: so verbs in *-iso*, as *singularizo*, *sollemnizo*, *auctorizo*; nouns in *-ismus*, as *cerebrismus*, *denarismus*; *-ista*, first in *tablista* and *computista*; *-issa*, as *fratrissa*, *sacerdotissa*, *diaconissa*; *-icus*, as *tussicus*, *strumaticus*, *lunaticus*, etc.

VI. Pp. 52-80. The Valesian fragment on the history of Constantine. E. Klebs. At the end of his edition of Ammianus (1636) H. Valois (Valesius) published two historical fragments which have since borne the title *Excerpta Valesiana*. They have nothing in common save that they are preserved to us in the same MS (cod. Philipp. No. 1885). The first fragment treats of the history of Constantine, and shows in some passages remarkable coincidence with Orosius. Valois assumed that in such cases the author of the fragment simply borrowed from Orosius, an assumption followed by Gardthausen. On the other hand, Görres (*Fleckeisen, Jhb.*, 1875, III, p. 201 ff.) reverses matters, and asserts the dependence of Orosius on the anonymous author. In this he is followed by Schwabe, *Teuffel*<sup>4</sup>, p. 1013. Neither of these theories is accepted by Klebs. The passages which show such accurate correspondence with Orosius he thinks are taken directly from that author, but not by the author of the fragments. They are rather the work of an interpolator, a Christian, who sought to give a more Christian coloring to the history of Constantine. The original author of the piece was not a Christian, though he was, possibly from personal relations to the emperor, an admirer of Constantine. The language of the work points to the fourth century, and its author was probably contemporaneous with Constantine.

P. 80. Manilius V 546 emended by R. Unger, who reads *Hic Hammon superat* for *Hic Hymenaeus erat*.

VII. Pp. 81-91. The marriage of Ptolemaeus Philadelphus with Arsinoe II. A. Wiedemann. The point of chief importance in fixing the much discussed date of Theocritus's seventeenth idyl is the date of this marriage, mentioned in the poem as already accomplished. The conclusion reached is that the marriage took place in or before 273 B. C. And as the poem nowhere refers to the co-regent appointed probably 271 (at latest 266), the poem must have been composed between 273 and 271 (or 266).

P. 91. Ad Alcaem (frg. 41 [31] Bgk.). Robinson Ellis proposes for *al rá* to read *alpe re*.

VIII. Pp. 92-107. Aethiopian myths. O. Gruppe. In the sixteenth supplement-volume of the *Jahrb. für Philol. u. Paedag.* Karl Tümpel attempts to prove that the Andromeda-myth was of Greek, not Oriental origin, and was carried by the Greeks to Phoenicia. Against these conclusions Gruppe brings some strong arguments to bear. It is interesting to note his identification of the Biblical story of Jonah with the Phoenician form of the Andromeda-myth, and in a similar vein his comments on Gen. 6, 1 ff.

IX. Pp. 108-162. Research in the domain of Greek history. Hugo Landwehr. The treatises discussed are classed under the following heads: Age of Pericles; Peloponnesian war; Period of national decline; Alexander the Great; Hellenism.

P. 162. Eussner emends *Aegritudo Perdicae* v. 254 in *Poet. Lat. min. V*, p. 123 Bhr., by reading *vesca* for *famem*.

## II.—MISCELLANEOUS.

1. Pp. 163-165. Metrical inscription of Metapontum (Cauer, 277), discussed by R. Peppmüller.

2. Pp. 165-168. The original place of the Pentecontaetia in the history of Thucydides. L. Holzapfel. After the Archaeology, which was apparently intended only to make clear the importance of the Peloponnesian war, it was proper to pass immediately to the direct causes of the war. On the other hand, the events of the Pentecontaetia could be very appropriately inserted after the representation of these immediate causes, in order to make good the assertion of the historian, that not these complications, but the growing power of Athens was the true cause of the war. Still as the chief object of the Pentecontaetia was to describe Athenian and Spartan affairs between the retreat of Xerxes and the Pelop. war, its natural place was immediately after the Archaeology, and that indeed was the original disposition, which was changed for the artistic reasons above mentioned.

3. P. 169. Death of the poet Helvius Cinna. L. Schwabe. Ribbeck (*Gesch. d. röm. Dicht.* I 343) says, "It is probable that Plutarch erred in his statement that the Cinna put to death on the occasion of Caesar's funeral by the enraged populace was the poet. He is the only author calling him by this name, and the more natural supposition is that it was the conspirator Cornelius Cinna." Against this view Schwabe shows from Valerius Maximus, Dio Cassius, and Appian, that it was the trib. pl. C. Helvius Cinna who was murdered, and L. Cornelius Cinna, the praetor, who escaped. Plutarch's statement is probably correct.

4. Cic. de Inventione. E. Stroebel. In a MS of Nicolaus of Cues (codex Cusanus) there is a fragment of this youthful work of Cicero which has not received the attention it merits. In four passages Stroebel thinks that it alone shows the correct reading: 160. Prudentia est rerum bonarum et malarum et neutrarum (PHS. utrarum, editors since Lambinus neutrarum) scientia. 161. Pietas, per quam sanguine coniunctis patriaeque benevolens (C. benivolis, editors since Orelli benivolum) officium et diligens tribuitur cultus. 164. Clementia, per quam animi temere in odium alicuius illecti concitatie (C. iniectionis concitati;  $\omega$  invectio concitata) comitate retinentur. 167. Quid verissime constituatur, alius locus erit considerandi (C. considerandus), thus verifying the conjecture of Lambinus.

5. P. 171. In the same MS is an excerpt of Cornificius ad Herennium, valuable especially for §3, 4. The MS clearly belongs to the same class as HP $\pi$ .

P. 172. While engaged in examining Italian MSS for Cicero's *Orationes in Pisonem* and *pro Flacco*, Stroebel has also kept an eye open for MSS of *de Inventione*. In Florence he compared four of the eleventh century, viz. Laur. plut. 50 cod. XII (A), cod. XX (D), cod. XLV (C), and Acquisti 120 (B). Of these A is closely related to S. C and D stand between PHS and the younger MSS. B seems to be somewhat independent and deserves study. In the Vaticana he found 3 MSS of the eleventh or twelfth century, Nos. 3234, 3235, 3236. Of these 3235 seems to be the best.

6. Pp. 173-176. S. Linde emends a number of passages in *Sen. Controv.* (cf. *Philol.* XLVI, p. 760).

7. P. 176. Juv. 5, 146-8 discussed by A. Häckermann.

8. Pp. 177-183. The prime of Alexander Polyhistor. G. F. Unger. Suidas's *ἦν ἐπὶ τῶν Σέλλα χρόνων καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε* is to be understood to mean only that Alexander first appears under Sulla, but not as writer, his literary prime indeed, so far as it can be determined, falling *more than a generation after Sulla's rule*.

9. Pp. 183-4. Reign of Hieronymus of Syracuse. G. F. Unger. The statement of Polyb. VII 7, 3, *παῖς παραλαβὼν τὴν ἀρχήν, εἰτα μῆνας οὐ πλείους τριῶν καὶ δέκα βιώσας μετέλλαξε τὸν βίον*, must be emended so as, for *τριῶν καὶ δέκα*, to read *τριῶν καὶ ἡμίσεος*. The sign for  $\frac{1}{2}$ , on account of similarity to Δ (*δέκα*), being often confused therewith. Hieronymus may have reigned from Aug. or Sept. till Dec. 215.

10. Pp. 185-6. Beast fables on ancient sculptures. O. Crusius. On a relief discussed in the *Archaeol. Zeitung* XXXIII (1876), p. 18 ff., is a group consisting of a swamp bird, a tortoise, and an eagle. This group has reference to the fable of the tortoise that wished to learn to fly, Babr. 115 (Phaedr. II 6).

11. P. 186. Macedonian in Lasos of Hermione. Y. This surprising discovery, made in the latest representation of the hist. of Gr. lit., is due to carelessly reading two totally disconnected excerpts in Athen. (X 455d) as if they were one.

12. Pp. 187-189. *Ὀντως* in comedy. O. Bachmann. The value of special dictionaries is shown by tracing the fortunes of this word through various editions of Aristophanes, dictionaries, and special treatises. The word seems to occur in Aristophanes (in all 15 times) first in the Knights, in Euripides in Ion. Who introduced it into Gr. literature? Probably Euripides first into poetry, and Aristophanes first used it in parody.

P. 190. Reports of journals. *Revue Arch.*, 1888, Nr. 1, 2, Jan., Feb.—*Academy* 1888, Jan. 7, 14; Feb. 4, 11, 25; March 3, 10, 17.—*Am. J. of Ph.* VIII 4 (32).

## Heft 2.

### I.—TREATISES.

X. Pp. 193-208. Greek proverbs. M. Treu and O. Crusius. M. Treu publishes some excerpts from collections of Greek proverbs which he discovered in Cod. Pal. gr. 129, a Heidelberg excerpt MS of the latter part of the fourteenth century, and Crusius adds some remarks as to the worth of the collection and its relation to others of the same kind.

P. 208. On the Homeric hymns. It has been conjectured already by Schwenck and Bergk that the hymns to Helios and Selene (XXX and XXXI) are to be ascribed to one author, and Crusius argues that XXIX belongs with these.

XI. Pp. 209-234. On Heraclitus. Christian Cron.

P. 234. In Aesch. Suppl. 55 C. Haeblerlin proposes *ἐγγαιος <ἐπ'> οἰκτρον αἰών*; 256, *χρᾶνθεϊο' ἀνῆκε γαῖα νηλέα δάκη* (for *μηρεῖται ἄκη*).

XII. Pp. 235-241. On the Anakreontea. O. Crusius discusses (1) the long ultima in *Anaklomenos* and *Anakr.* 2a and 50; (2) the date of composition of *Anakr.* 21-32, against F. Hanssen's attempt to prove (*Philol.* XLVI, p. 446 ff.) that the author of these verses was probably a Jewish poet of the Alexandrine period (*Aristobulus*).

XIII. Pp. 242-273. Poseidonios and Plutarch on Roman proper names. Adolf Bauer attempts (1) out of scattered extracts taken mainly from Plut. to reconstruct a bit of the work of Poseidonios, (2) to get therefrom some hints as to Plut.'s mode of using his sources.

What Plutarch teaches about Roman names falls, in the main, into two parts: the statements as to the nature of the cognomina and their late application, as well as with regard to the threefold designation, were taken, so far as can be determined, from Poseidonios; the other statements come from Roman antiquarians. Poseidonios seems to have treated rather fully of Roman name-giving, comparing with the Greek, and especially treating the cognomen. This treatment of Poseidonios belonged doubtless not to a special treatise, but the evidence seems to point to the first of his 52 books *μετὰ Πολύβιον*.

Bauer concludes from the manner in which Plut. seems to have used Pos., that in his Lives he does not make some source his foundation, or a mosaic from several, but cites for the most part from memory, and draws in general in the composition of his Lives freely and independently from an extensive knowledge.

P. 273. M. Petschenig proposes emendations in Apuleius Met. XI 9 and 19.

XIV. Pp. 274-290. Active adjectives in *-bilis* in Archaic Latin. Fr. Hansen. This paper contains a list of all the adjs. in *-bilis* before the year 100 B. C. and an examination of their signification. Truly active meaning he nowhere finds. They are either pass. or stand in a sort of intermediate state between act. and pass., which he characterizes as instrumental or causative. Thus, we never find *homo adiutabilis*, "a man who can aid," though we do find *causa vincibilis*, "a cause with which we can triumph," corresponding to *causa vincitur*, as the pass. of a possible *vincere causam*. Towards the close the author goes into a careful analysis of the grammatical categories, subject and object, active and passive.

P. 290. M. Petschenig emends Apuleius, Apol. cap. II, pp. 4, 6 (Krueg), by substituting *subiit tacere* in for *subito tacerem*, and *descriptio* for *descriptionem*.

XV. Pp. 290-309. Cicero, *Partitiones Oratoriae*. W. Friedrich. A valuable critical discussion based on the following MSS: two Parisini, 7231 and 7696, both of the tenth century; three Erlangenses, 848, 858, 863, Redigeranus and Vitebergensis, all of these being of the fifteenth century.

XVI. Pp. 310-319. *Quaestiones Vergilianae*. C. Haebelin. Suetonius, in his life of Vergil, preserved to us by Donatus, says that the poet recited three books of the Aeneid, viz. II, IV, VI, in the presence of the Emperor Augustus. Accepting these then as the first books that were finished, there may still be found proof that they were reworked after the others were written, since a good many passages in these three books refer to incidents in the other books, and were evidently added after they had been written. For instance, II 65, 66 seem to have been added in view of I 753, 754; so too IV 21, which Peerkamp rejected as spurious, is rather to be explained as an afterthought added by Vergil himself in remembrance of I 343 ff. Following out all the suggestions of this kind, the writer lays down the following order of composition for the Aeneid: II, IV, VI, V, III, I, VIII-XII, VII.

P. 319. Apuleius, Apol. Three passages emended by M. Petschenig.

XVII. Pp. 320-327. Wit and humor in Juvenal. Jul. Jessen. Under this title are discussed some ten passages of Juv., in some of which Jessen contents himself with special interpretations, while in others he suggests emendations of the text.

P. 327. Apuleius, Apol. LXXIV. M. Petschenig follows the MS reading commentator against Krlger's commentor.

XVIII. Pp. 328-343. Aethiopian myths. O. Gruppe. This is a continuation of the same subjects as were treated in a former article (No. VIII), and contains an examination of the narrative of Hyginus in reference to Phaethon, and Deucalion and Pyrrha, and a defence of the genuineness of the same against the attacks especially of Knaack in the *Wochenschrift f. Class. Philol.* 1886, S. 859, and *Hermes* XXII, S. 640.

P. 343. Aristophanes, Av. 1080, discussed by O. Bachmann.

XIX. Pp. 344-369. Report on researches concerning the Orient. A. Wiedemann (cf. *Philol.* XLV 689).

## II.—MISCELLANEOUS.

13. Pp. 370-374. O. Bachmann proposes emendations in Aristophanes Av. 1212, 375, 1579, and Vesp. 941.

14. Pp. 374-5. Theophr. Char. 28a med. G. F. Unger proposes for *αἰκία τις* to read *ἐκύλλα τις*.

15. Pp. 375-378. Emendationum ad Aristidem specimen. W. Schmid proposes numerous emendations or omissions.

16. Pp. 378-382. Tibullus II 4. H. Belling. Critical discussion of several passages. In v. 5 he approves *seu nil peccavimus* instead of *seu quid*; v. 12 *omnia nunc* for *omnia nam*; v. 27-31 and 35-38 there is considerable alteration and corruption; v. 43 for *nec erit* we should read *nec sit*.

17. Pp. 382-384. ΔΗΑΙΟΣ ΚΟΛΥΜΒΗΤΗΣ mentioned in the Apophthegm of Socrates, preserved by Diog. Laert. II 22, Crusius thinks may have been the Glaucus referred to by Aristotle (apud Athen. VII, p. 296 C), who before he was turned into a sea-god had been a skilful fisherman and diver.

P. 384. S. Linde changes an emendation made in the preceding Heft (p. 173) in Sen. Controv. II 12, p. 159, 5 sqq., suggesting now *quamvis timetis spueri in hoc pavementum levatum et infusum tectis aurum*.

P. 384. Reports of journals. *Journal of Philology* (92).—*Am. J. of Phil.* IX 1 (33).

C. H. KIRKLAND.

CHARLES FORSTER SMITH.

### BRIEF MENTION.

In a prelection entitled *Die Entstehung der griechischen Literatursprachen* (Leipzig, Weigel, 1890) Prof. EDUARD ZARNCKE has emphasized the difference between the literary and the spoken language of Greece—a difference which is denied by some and restricted within narrow limits by others. It will be seen by this statement of the theme that Zarncke comes into sharp collision with those who would restore the local dialect to such masters of lyric poetry as Pindar, and in restoring the local dialect destroy the peace of mind of the unfortunate editors who have seen in the iridescence of Pindar's language an especial charm. Why a mixed dialect, a poetic dialect, should be impossible for Greece in view of all that we know in regard to modern dialects, in view of all that we know and feel as to our own composite language, in which we consciously use antiquated and obsolescent words and forms for the purpose of producing a special artistic effect—that is a matter which will probably continue to be a puzzle to the older generation of philologists; and it is a comfort in the midst of our bewilderment to learn that there is so much to be said in favor of the traditional view. That this literary language is not a purely artificial language, that it grows and is not made, that it has its organic limits as well as an organic origin, is most true, but the whole matter is one of extreme delicacy, and is not to be settled by the assumption of arbitrary variation on the one hand, or of mechanical *μεταγραφή* on the other.

It is possible to look upon Plato simply as a great artist, and those who regard a philosopher as a *poète manqué* will dwell with especial pleasure on those of Plato's dialogues in which the master has attained the greatest perfection of form. And yet, whoever takes Plato in hand for the purpose of making an edition of this or that dialogue, if he neglects the form in the *Timaeus* or the matter in the *Symposium*, will wake up to find that he has not been just, I will not say to the ideal conditions of his task, but to any decent conception of it. A teacher, aware of his own limitations in either direction, may satisfy his conscience by referring his pupils to works from which they may get the light that is denied him, but an editor has no woe upon him to edit as the teacher has to teach, and while no one can object to Mr. WARREN's talking in a familiar and not altogether uninstructional way to his students at Magdalen, and waiving questions now of language, now of thought, every one who has to deal seriously with Plato must object to the perpetuation of that leisurely chat in an edition of the *Republic of Plato, Books I-V* (London and New York, Macmillan & Co., 1888). Bows to the right of him, bows to the left of him, compliments in season and out of season to Dr. Jowett, friendly salutations to Mr. Mahaffy, all manner of personal courtesies, all manner of irrelevancies and lecture-room 'skits,' these are things that those who are not hanging on the words of the President of St. Mary Magdalen could well dispense with. 'We do not care to be told,' to quote the admirable language

of a Saturday Reviewer *à propos* of American divagations, 'we do not care to be told' about a 'fine, fruity comment' of Muretus, we resent having a long extract from Boswell's Johnson lugged in for the sake of an utterly useless parallel with *ἔτι λέγειν αὐτὸν ἐκίνουν* (329 D), and we could readily give up some of the President's picturesque English in exchange for less picturesque Greek accentuation. But as we are to have a serious edition of the Republic before long, it is hardly worth while to go minutely through a book which is almost confessedly a stop-gap, in order to point out its many carelessnesses and flippancies. And yet 'one Aristoxenus' (p. xxvii) is good. Who would dream that 'one Aristoxenus' is the great Aristoxenus of Tarentum, to whose theories of art Westphal has consecrated an entire volume? And one specimen of literary 'kowtowing' may be cited as an illustration of the excessive reverence paid to great names—a failing in which Mr. Warren has only too much company. "'Conduct," Mr. Warren remarks (p. xxvi), 'as we now all know, "is three-fourths of life."' "As we *now* all know"—and so this text from the gospel according to Matthew Arnold is gravely cited, as if the world had waited for the advent of Mr. Matthew Arnold to be told that *βίος* is *βίος*! Every time that sentence is quoted I think of Mr. Arnold as the unjust steward who said 'Take thy bill and write fourscore' save five.

---

Dr. ALBERT JAHN, the venerable explorer of patristic literature, has given in his *Dionysiaca* (Altona u. Leipzig, Roher, 1889) another proof of the way in which Christian Greek literature is interpenetrated by Platonic diction and Platonic thought. In this 'Platonic anthology from Dionysius the so-called Areopagite' he has shown—in reinforcement of his previous studies—that no proper appreciation of the religious literature of that period is possible without constant reference to Plato, and the student of Christianity as well as the student of Plato will find much that is suggestive in Dr. Jahn's researches.

---

#### CORRECTION.

In the last number of the Journal (X 4, Whole No. 40), p. 467, l. 14, for *νυσταλογερόντων* read *νυσταλογερόντων*; p. 468, l. 3, for *ναύπλοι* read *ναύτιλοι*.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Aeschines. Aeschines against Ctesiphon; ed., on the basis of Weidner's ed., by R. B. Richardson. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1889. 4 + 279 pp. 12mo, cl. \$1.50.

Allinson (Francis G.) Greek prose composition. Boston, *Allyn & Bacon*, 1890. 204 pp. 16mo, cl. \$1.20.

Caesar, Caius Jul. De bello gallico; commentariorum 6; ed. by C. Colbeck. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 34 + 91 pp. 16mo, cl. 40 cents.

Century Dictionary (The). Prepared under the superintendence of W. D. Whitney. In 6 v. V. 2. New York, *The Century Co.*, 1890. 4 + 1201-2422 pp., il. 4to, full shp. Subs. \$15.

Euclid. The eleventh book of Euclid's Elements, propositions 1-21; ed. by F. H. Stevens. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 6 + 383-430 pp. 16mo, cl. 30 cts.

Goodwin (W. Watson). Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb. New ed., rewritten and enl. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. 31 + 464 pp. 8vo, cl. \$2.15.

Mahaffy (J. P.) A history of classical Greek literature. In 2 v. V. 1. The poets. 2d rev. ed. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 14 + 539 pp. 12mo, cl. \$2.25.

Murray (J. A. H.) New English dictionary on historical principles. Pt. 5. Cast-Clivy. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. 4to, cl. \$3.25.

### ENGLISH.

Aeschylus. The House of Atreus. By E. D. A. Morshead. New ed. Post 8vo, 206 pp. *Simpkin*. 5s.

Anderson (John). English intercourse with Siam in the seventeenth century. With map. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) 8vo, 510 pp. *Kegan Paul, Trübner & Co.* 15s.

Aristophanes. The Birds. With introduction and notes by W. W. Merry. Part I. Introd. and text. Extra fcap., 184 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 3s. 6d.

Edgar (J.) Alphabetical index to the Greek terminations. Fcap., sd. *Cornish & Sons*. 1s. 6d.

Euripides. Iphigenia at Aulis. With introd. and notes by C. E. S. Hendlam. 12mo, 156 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 2s. 6d.

H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. Novum Testamentum cum parallelis s. scripturae locis vetere capitulorum notatione canonibus Eusebii. Accedunt tres appendices. Fcap., 8vo, xx-654-200 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 6s.; roan, 7s. 6d.; mor., 10s. 6d.

Harding (W. J.) The simple sentence in Greek. 8vo, 76 pp. *Livingtons*. 2s.

King (J. E.) and Cookson (C.) An introduction to the comparative grammar of Greek and Latin. Cr. 8vo, viii-224 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 5s. 6d.

Lloyd and Sanday. Greek Testament, with critical appendices. 12mo, 180 pp. *Frowde*. 6s.

Millington (Herbert). Translations into Latin verse. Fcap. vellum. *Bell & Sons*. 2s. 6d.

Moulton (Richard G.) The ancient classical drama: a study in literary evolution. Cr. 8vo, 476 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 8s. 6d.

New dictionary of quotations from the Greek, Latin, and modern languages. Trans. into English. With index. 20th ed. Cr. 8vo, 500 pp. *J. F. Shaw*. 6s.

Pliny's Letters. Books 1 and 2. With introd., notes and plan. Edit. by James Cowan. 12mo, 232 pp. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Postgate (J. P.) Sermo Latinus. Key to selected passages. Cr. 8vo. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

Preston (Rev. George). Exercises in Latin verse of various kinds. Key. Fcap. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Psalms (The) in Greek according to the Septuagint. Edited by Henry B. Swete. Cr. 8vo. *Cambridge University Press*. 2s. 6d.

Sacred books of the East. Vol. 33. The minor law books. Trans. by Julius Jolly. Part I. Nārada Brihaspati. 8vo, 416 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 10s. 6d.

— Vol. 34. The Vedānta-Sūtras. With the commentary by Sankara. Trans. by George Thibaut. Part I. 8vo, 558 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 12s. 6d.

Salmons (H. Anthony). An Arabic-English dictionary on a new system. 2 vols. 1450 pp. *Kegan Paul, Trübner & Co.* 36s.

Sargent (John Young). Exemplaria Graeca: Selections from passages for translation into Greek. 12mo, 106 pp. *Frowde*. 3s.

Sayce (A. H.) Introduction to the Science of Language. 3d ed. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo, 880 pp. *Kegan Paul, Trübner & Co.* 9s.

Stone (E. D.) Selection from the Greek tragedians. Cr. 8vo, 212 pp. *Rivingtons*. 3s. 6d.

Tacitus. Histories. Books 3, 4, 5. With introduction and notes by A. D. Godley. 12mo, 304 pp. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Tertullian's Apology for the Christians. Trans. by T. Herbert Bindley. Post. 8vo, 176 pp. *Parker*. 3s. 6d.

Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus. Rendered into English prose, with introductory essay, by A. Lang. Large paper ed. 8vo. *Macmillan*. 9s.

Thucydides. Book 4. A revision of the text, illustrating the principal causes of corruption in the manuscripts of this author. By William Gunion Rutherford. 8vo, 190 pp. *Macmillan*. 7s. 6d.

Valerius Maximus, Selections from. With notes by W. R. Inge. Cr. 8vo, 336 pp. *Rivingtons*. 3s. 6d.

Virgil. The Eclogues and Georgics. Trans. from the Latin by J. W. Mackail. 16mo. *Rivingtons*. 5s.

— Georgics. Lib. I. Edited for the use of schools by T. E. Page. With vocabulary. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, 120 pp. *Macmillan*. 1s. 6d.

Wollaston (Arthur N.) A complete English-Persian dictionary. Compiled from original sources. Roy. 4to. *W. H. Allen & Co.* 94s. 6d.

Xenophon. Works. Trans. by H. G. Dakyns. 4 vols. Vol. I. Post 8vo, 514 pp. *Macmillan*. 10s. 6d.

## FRENCH.

Bréal (Michel). La Réforme de l'orthographe française. In-12. *Hachette*. 1 fr.

Jasmin (Jacques). Œuvres complètes. Les Papilhôtes (les Papillotes). Avec un essai d'orthographe patoise par Boyer d'Agen. 4 vols. Gr. in-8. *Harvard*. 30 fr.

La Grasserie (Raoul de). Études de grammaire comparée. Catégorie des cas. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 15 fr.

Ouvré (H.) Démosthène. In-8 ill. *Lecène et Oudin*. 1 fr. 50.

Pellisson (M.) Cicéron. In-8 ill. *Lecène et Oudin*. 1 fr. 50.

Virey (Philippe). Quelques observations sur l'Épisode d'Aristée à propos d'un monument égyptien. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 2 fr. 50.

## GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. 5. Bd., 2. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 7. (1. u. 2. m. 8.60.) Inhalt: Nemesis u. Adrasteia. Eine mythologisch-archäolog. Abhandlg. v. Dr. Herm. Posnansky. ix, 184 S. m. 1 Doppeltaf. in Heliograv.

Alaudae. 1. Jahrg. 12 Nrn. (B.) gr. 8. Aquilae. Leipzig, *Brockhaus'* *Sort*. m. 2.40.

Avesta. Die hell. Bücher der Parsen, hrsg. v. Karl F. Geldner. 6. Lfg. Imp. 4. 2. Thl. Khorde Avesta, S. 161-277. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer*, 1889. m. 12. (1-6, m. 52.)

— The sacred books of the Parsis, edited by Karl F. Geldner. Fasc. 4. Imp. 4. II. Khorda Avesta, S. 161-277. Ebd., 1889. m. 18. (1-6, m. 78.)

Bauer (Jak.) Das Bild in der Sprache. II. gr. 8, 41 S. Ansbach, 1889. Leipzig, *Fock*. à m. 1.

Beheim-Schwarzbach (Felix). Libellus περὶ ἐπιμνησας, qui Demetrii nomine inscriptus est, quo tempore compositus sit. Diss. gr. 8, 40 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.20.

Bibliothek, keilinschriftliche. Sammlung v. assyr. u. babylon. Texten in Umschrift u. Übersetzung. In Verbindg. m. L. Abel, C. Bezold, P. Jensen, F. E. Peiser, H. Winckler, hrsg. v. Eberh. Schrader. 2. Bd. Mit chronolog. Beigaben u. 1 Karte v. H. Kiepert. gr. 8, vi, 291 S. Berlin, *Reuther*. m. 12. (1. u. 2., m. 21.)

Bidder (Hugo). De Strabonis studiis Homericis capita selecta. Diss. gr. 8, 56 S. Gedani, 1889. Königsberg, *Koch*. m. 1.50.

Böhtlingk (O.) Brhadâranjakobanishad in der Mâdhjamdina-Recension. Hrsg. u. übers. gr. 8, iv, 100 S. St. Petersburg, 1889. Leipzig, *Voss'* *Sort in Comm.* m. 5.

Calvary's philologische u. archäologische Bibliothek. 87. u. 88. Bd. 8. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. à m. 1.50; Einzelpr. à m. 2. Inhalt: Karl Reisig's Vorlesungen üb. lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. Mit den Anmerkgn. v. Frdr. Haase. 2. Tl. Neu bearb. v. Ferd. Heerdegen. 2. u. 3. Lfg. vii u. S. 97-155 u. Register v. G. Landgraf lvi S. 2. Tl. cplt. m. 4; Register zu den 2 Tln. m. 2.

Caesaris (C. Jul.) Commentarii cum supplementis A. Hirtii et aliorum. Iterum recognovit et adnotationem criticam praemisit Emanuel Hoffmann. 2

voll., 8. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. m. 4.50. Inhalt: I. Commentarii de bello Gallico. xlii, 263 S. m. 2.—II. Commentarii de bello civili. Accedunt commentarii de bello Alexandrino, Africano, Hispaniensi. lxxxvi, 321 S. m. 2.50.

Censorini de die natali liber. Ad codicum denuo collatorum fidem recensuit Johs. Cholodniak. gr. 8, iii, 79 S. St. Petersburg, *Ricker*, 1889. m. 1.

Cicero, in C. Verrem accusationis liber quintus. Scholarum in usum ed. Aloisius Kornitzer. 12, 121 S. m. e. lith. Karte. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. cart. m. —90.

Diels (Herm.) Sibyllinische Blätter. gr. 8, 158 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 2.80.

Erman (Adf.) Die Sprache d. Papyrus Westcar. Eine Vorarbeit zur Grammatik der älteren aegypt. Sprache. 4, 158 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* 1889. m. 18.

Finsler (Geo.) Die Orestie d. Aischylos. 4, 54 S. Bern, *Schmid, Francke & Co.* m. 2.

Foerster (Rich.) Quaestiones physiognomonicae. 4, 17 S. Kiel, *Universitäts-Buchhandlg.* m. 1.

Fritze (Ernst). De Juli Frontini strategematon libro IV. Diss. gr. 8, 51 S. Halae Sax., 1888. Berlin, *Heinrich & Kemke*. m. 1.20.

Frohnmeier (L. J.) A progressive grammar of the Malayalam language for Europeans. gr. 8, xvi, 307 S. Mangalore, 1889. Basel, *Missionsbuchhandlg.* geb. m. 6.40.

Geffcken (Johs.) De Stephano Byzantio. 4, 28 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.*, 1889. m. 2.

Gesenius (Wilh.) Hebräisches u. aramäisches Handwörterbuch üb. das Alte Testament. 11. durchgeseh. Aufl. Lex.-8, xii, 932 S. Leipzig, *F. C. W. Vogel*. m. 15.

Glaserapp (C. Fr.) Die Entwicklung der bildenden Kunst bei den Griechen. gr. 8, vii, 43 S. Riga, *Mellin & Co.* m. 1.20.

Goetz (Geo.) Commentatiuncula Macrobianae. 4, viii S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. —50.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung m. besond. Rücksicht auf Geschichte u. Methodik der einzelnen Disziplinen. Hrsg. v. Iwan Müller. 2. Bd., 2. völlig neubearb. u. sehr verm. Aufl. [Griechische u. lateinische Sprachwissenschaft.] 2. Hälfte. gr. 8. München, *Beck*. m. 8.50. 2. Bd. cplt. m. 15.50; Einbd. m. 2. Inhalt: Lateinische Grammatik, bearb. v. Stolz u. Schmalz. S. 400–584.—Lexikographie der griech. u. latein. Sprache, neubearb. v. G. Autenrieth u. F. Heerdegen. S. 585–635.—Rhetorik der Griechen u. Römer, neubearb. v. Rich. Volkmann. S. 637–676.—Metrik der Griechen u. Römer, neubearb. v. H. Gleditsch. S. 677–870.—Nachträge u. Indices. xx u. S. 871–942.

Hart (Geo.) Ursprung u. Verbreitung der Pyramus- u. Thisbe-Sage. Diss. gr. 8, 57 S. Passau, 1889. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.60.

Hartman (I. I.) De Carolo Gabriel Cobet. gr. 8, 16 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 1.20.

Hermes. Zeitschrift f. class. Philologie, hrsg. v. Geo. Kaibel u. Carl Robert. 25. Bd., 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 160 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 14.

Hirzel (Arnold). Gleichnisse u. Metaphern im Rigveda. gr. 8, vi, 107 S. Leipzig, *Friedrich*. m. 3.

- Horatius Flaccus (Q.) Erklärt v. Herm. Schütz. 1. Tl. Oden u. Epoden. 3. Aufl. gr. 8, viii, 431 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 3.
- Hörling (Wilh.) Sammlung lateinischer Sätze. 1. Hft. Sätze zu den Regeln üb. den Konjunktiv. gr. 8, 94 S. Paderborn, *Junfermann*. m. 1.
- Hoerschelmann (Wilh.) Catull. 68. 4. 24 S. Dorpat, *Karow*. m. —50.
- Huth (Geo.) Die Zeit d. Kālidāsa. gr. 8, 68 S. m. 1 Tab. Berlin, *Th. Huth*, 1890. m. 2.
- Jahrbücher, neue, f. Philologie u. Pädagogik. Hrsg. unter der Red. v. Alfr. Fleckeisen u. Herm. Masius. 141. u. 142. Bd., 12 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 160 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 30.
- Jensen (P.) Die Kosmologie der Babylonier. Studien u. Materialien. gr. 8, xvi, 546 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 40.
- Kebes, das Gemälde im Kronostempel. Aus dem Griech. übers. u. m. Erläuterugn. versehen v. S. Krauss. 2. Aufl. gr. 8, 33 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. m. —80.
- Kielhorn (F.) Tafeln zur Berechnung der Jupiter-Jahre nach den Regeln d. Sūrya-Siddhānta u. d. Jyotistattva. 4, 18 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.*, 1889. m. 1.40.
- Klamroth (Mart.) Die 50 ältesten Suren d. Korans in gereimter deutscher Uebersetzung. gr. 8, v, 128 S. Hamburg, *Herold's Verl.*, 1890. m. 2.80.
- Koch (Lothar.) Xenophonsätze zur Einübung der griechischen Syntax in Tertia u. Secunda. gr. 8, vi, 84 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 1.20.
- Κοντογένης, Σπυρίδων, Διορθωτικὰ εἰς τὰ ἔθνικὰ Στεφάνου τοῦ Βυζαντίου. 'Εκ-  
τοῦτὰς ἁ. gr. 8, 97 S. Erlangen. Jena, *Doebereiner Nachf.* m. 6.
- Kronenberg (Aug. Johs.) Minuciana sive annotationes criticae in Minucii Felicis Octavium. gr. 8, v, 90 S. Leiden, *van Doesburgh*. m. 2.
- Larsen (Sofus Chr.) Studia critica in Plutarchi moralia. Diss. gr. 8, 152 S. Kopenhagen, *Hagerup*, 1889. m. 3.
- Lehmann (Ed.) De publica Romanorum servitute quaestiones. Diss. gr. 8, 46 S. Leipzig, *Fock*, 1889. m. 1.
- Lehner (Hans.) Üb. die athenischen Schatzverzeichnisse d. 4. Jahrh. Diss. gr. 8, 137 S. Strassburg, *Trübner in Comm.* m. 3.
- Lexikon, ausführliches, der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie, im Verein m. Th. Birt, O. Crusius, R. Engelmann, etc., hrsg. v. W. H. Roscher. Mit zahlreichen Abbildgn. 15. Lfg., Lex.-8. Sp. 2465–2688. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 2.
- Männer (A.) English-Tulu dictionary. gr. 8, vi, 653 S. Mangalore, 1888. Basel, *Missionsbuchhandlg.* geb. m. 9.60.
- Marcelli de medicamentis liber. Ed. Geo. Helmreich. 8, vi, 414 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 3.60.
- Meister (Rich.) Zum eleischen, arkadischen u. kyprischen Dialekte. gr. 8, 45 S. Leipzig, *Giesecke & Devrient*. m. 1.20.
- Menge (Rud.) et Preuss (Sieg.) Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasc. IX et X. Lex.-8, Sp. 1025–1280. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 1.60.
- Merguet (H.) Lexikon zu den Schriften Cicero's m. Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. 2. Tl. Lexikon zu den philosoph. Schriften. 5. u. 6. Hft., Lfg. 17–24. Lex.-8. S. 641–938. Jena, *Fischer*. m. 15. (1–6 [1. Bd.] m. 47.)
- Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca philologica Batava, collegerunt S. A. Naber, J. van Leeuwen, Jr., I. M. J. Valetton. Nova series. Vol. XVIII. 4 partes. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 112 S. Lugduni Batavorum. Leipzig, *Harrassowitz*. m. 9.

Müller (Frdr.) Die äquatoriale Sprachfamilie in Central-Afrika. Lex.-8, 16 S. Wien, *Tempisky in Comm.* m. —40.

Museum, Rheinisches, f. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Otto Ribbeck u. Frz. Buecheler. Neue Folge. 45. Bd., 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 160 S. Frankfurt a-M., *Sauerländer.* m. 14.

Neudecker (Geo.) Der klassische Unterricht u. die Erziehung zu wissenschaftlichem Denken. 8, 39 S. Würzburg, *Stuber's Verl.* m. —60.

Nix (Ludw.) Das 5. Buch der Conica d. Apollonius v. Perga in der arabischen Uebersetzung d. Thabit Ibn Corrah. Leipziger Promotionsschrift. gr. 8, 48 S. m. Fig. Leipzig, *Hiersemann*, 1889. m. 2.

Peters (Johs.) De C. Valerii Flacci vita et carmine. Diss. gr. 8, 86 S. Regimontani. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.50.

Piehl (Karl). Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques, recueillis en Égypte. II. Série. I. Planches. hoch 4, 154 autogr. Taf. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 40. I. u. II. 1, m. 108.)

Plutarchi Chaeronensis moralia, recognovit Greg. N. Bernadakis. Vol. II. 8, xxii, 557 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1889. à m. 3.

Polionis (C. Asini). De bello Africo commentarius. Recensuerunt Ed. Wölflin et A. Miodonki. 8, xl, 264 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1889. m. 6.80.

Reinisch (Leo). Die Kunama-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. Lex.-8, 96 S. Wien, *Tempisky in Comm.* m. 1.80. (I. u. II. m. 3.20.)

Rodemeyer (Karl Thdr.) Das praesens historicum bei Herodot u. Thukydides. Diss. gr. 8, 71 S. Basel, 1889. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.60.

Rohde (Erwin). Psyche. Seelencult u. Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen. 1. Hälfte. gr. 8, 294 S. Freiburg i-B., *Mohr.* m. 7; feine Ausg. m. 8.

Rundschau, neue philologische. Hrsg. v. C. Wagener u. E. Ludwig. Jahrg. 1890. 26 Nrn. (B.) gr. 8. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. m. 12.

Scala (Rud. v.) Die Studien d. Polybios. I. gr. 8, xvi, 344 S. Stuttgart, *Kohlhammer.* m. 5.

Schantz (Otto). Lateinische Lieder. [In der Ausstattung e. mittelalterl. Handschrift auf dünnem Pergamentpapier.] hoch 4, 39 Bl. Düsseldorf, *F. Bagel*, 1889. m. 2.

Schenck (Ludov.) De Telesphoro deo. Diss. gr. 8, 55 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.* m. 1.40.

Schmidt (Karl). Lateinische Schulgrammatik. 7. verb. u. verkürzte Aufl. gr. 8, viii, 236 S. Wien, *Hölder*, 1889. m. 2; Einbd. m. —40.

Schmidt (Rich.) Vier Erzählungen aus dem Çukasaptati. Samskrt u. Deutsch. gr. 8, 52 S. Kiel, *Haeseler Verl.* m. 2.

Schuchhardt (Carl.) Schliemann's Ausgrabungen, im Lichte der heutigen Wissenschaft dargestellt. Mit 2 Portraits, 6 Karten u. Plänen u. 290 Abbildgn. gr. 8, xii, 371 S. Leipzig, *Bruckhaus.* m. 8; Einbd. m. 1.50.

Schütz (Herm.) Sophokleische Studien. gr. 8, viii, 450 S. Potsdam, *Stein.* m. 6.

Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth. 11. Bd., Suppl.-Hft. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Hirzel*, 1889. m. 8. (11. Bd. cplt. m. Suppl. m. 17.) Inhalt: Strabonis *ιστορικῶν ὑπομνημάτων* fragmenta collegit et enarravit adiectis quaestionibus Strabonianis Paulus Otto. 350 S.

Studien auf dem Gebiete d. archaischen Lateins, hrsg. v. Wilh. Studemund.

A. u. d. T.: *Studia in priscos scriptores latinos collata*, ed. Guil. S. I. Bd., 2. Hft. gr. 8, S. 317-643. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 7. (1. u. 2. m. 10.)

Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth. 12. Bd., 1. Hft. gr. 8, 231 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 6.

Studien, Prager philologische. Hrsg. v. Otto Keller. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Prag, *Dominicus*. m. 1.20. (1. u. 2. m. 2.10.) Inhalt: Jos. Thüssing, de temporum et modorum in enuntiatis pendentibus apud C. Plinium Secundum usu. Fasc. I. 67 S.

Studien, Wiener. Zeitschrift f. class. Philologie. Suppl. der Zeitschrift f. österr. Gymnasien. Red. W. v. Hartel, K. Schenkl. 12. Jahrg. 1890. 2 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 158 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. m. 6.

Susemihl (Francisc.) *De Theogoniae Orphicae forma antiquissima dissertatio*. 4. xxi S. Gryphiswaldiae. Berlin, *Calvary & Co*. m. 1.60.

Sutta Nipāta, das. Eine Sammlg. v. Gesprächen, welche zu den kanon. Büchern der Buddhisten gehört. Aus der engl. Übersetzg. v. Prof. V. Fausböll ins Deutsche übertr. v. Dr. Arth. Pfungst. I. Lfg. gr. 8, x, 80 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*, 1889. m. 1.50.

Teuffel's (W. S.) *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Neubearb. v. Ludw. Schwabe. 5. Aufl., 1. Bd. gr. 8, xiv, 648 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 7.20.

Toller (Otto). *De spectaculis, cenis, distributionibus in municipiis romanis occidentis imperatorum aetate exhibitis*. Diss. gr. 8, 102 S. Altenburg. Leipzig, *Focke*. m. 2.

Wentzel (Geo.) *De grammaticis graecis quaestiones selectae*. I. 'Επικλήσεις, sive de deorum cognominibus per grammaticorum graecorum scripta dispersis. gr. 8, vi, 9; 13, 12, 4, 34, 27 u. 65 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 3.

Wissowa (Geo.) *August Reifferscheid. Ein Lebensabriss*. gr. 8, 16 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co*. m. 1.20.

Wochenschrift f. klassische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Geo. Andresen, Frz. Harder u. Herm. Heller. 7. Jahrg. 1890. 52 Nrn. 2 B. Hoch 4. Berlin, *Gaertner*. Vierteljährlich. m. 6.

— *Berliner philologische*. Hrsg. v. Chr. Belger u. O. Seyffert. Mit dem Beiblatt: *Bibliotheca philologica classica* bei Vorausbestellg. auf den vollständ. Jahrg. 19. Jahrg. 1890. 52 Nrn. 2 B. Hoch 4. Berlin, *Calvary & Co*. Vierteljährlich. m. 6.

Xenophon's *Anabasis*. Für den Schulgebrauch hrsg. v. Andreas Weidner. 8, xx, 266 S. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 1.50. Einbd. m. —25.

Zarncke (Ed.) *Die Entstehung der griechischen Literatursprachen*. gr. 8. vii, 53 S. Leipzig, *T. O. Weigel Nachf.* m. 1.20.

*Zeitschrift f. Völkerpsychologie u. Sprachwissenschaft*. Hrsg. v. Lazarus u. Steinthal unter Mitwirkg. v. Ulr. Jahn. 20. Bd. 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1. Hft. 132 S. Berlin, *Asher & Co*. m. 12.

Ziegler (Rev. F.) *A School Dictionary, English and Canarese*. 2 ed., revised and considerably enlarged. gr. 8, viii, 522 S. Mangalore, 1889. Basel, *Missionsbuchhandlg.* geb. m. 4.

## ITALIAN.

Barsottini (p. Ger.) *Epigrafi italiane e latine, precedute da un commento sulla vita e scritti dell' autore per Cesare Maggi*. Siena. In-16, pag. 289. L. 2.50.

Lisia. Orazioni contro Erastostene e contro Agorato, con prefazione e vocabolario di G. Müller. 2. ediz. riv. Torino. In-8, pag. 56. L. —80.

Thompson-Fumagalli. Paleografia. Un vol. di p. 164 con 21 incisioni nel testo e 4 tavole in fototipia. (Manuali Hoepli.) L. 2.

Vallauri (Tom.) *Scriptiones criticae*. Siena. In-16, pag. 279. L. 2.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

'Αδαμάντιος Κοραΐς ὑπὸ Δ. Θερειανοῦ. Ἐκτυποῦται ἀναλώμασι τοῦ Οἰκονομείου κληροδοτήματος. Τόμοι γ'. ἐν Τεργέστη. Τύποις τοῦ Αἰστροσυγγρικοῦ Λόγδ, 1889-1890.

Aeschines against Ctesiphon (On the Crown). Ed. on the basis of Weidner's edition, by Rufus B. Richardson. (College Series of Greek Authors.) Boston and London, *Ginn & Co.*, 1889. \$1.50.

Allen (T. W.). Notes on Abbreviations in Greek MSS. With eleven pages of facsimiles by photo-lithograph. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1889. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* 5s.

Aristophanes. The Birds. With introduction and notes by W. W. Merry. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* (Through Messrs. Cushings & Co., Balto.) 1889.

Balg (G. H.) A Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language, with especial reference to English and German. Ninth part. Mayville, Wis., *The Author*. New York, *Westermann & Co.* Complete (1887-1889). \$4.50.

Baran (Anton). Schul-Commentar zu Demosthenes' Staatsreden. Mit 4 Abbildgn. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. m. 1.25.

Bibliotheca Platonica. An exponent of the Platonic philosophy. Ed. by Thomas M. Johnson. Osceola, Mo. Vol. I, No. 2. Annual subscription \$3.

Brinton (D. G.) Essays of an Americanist. I. Ethnologic and Archaeologic. II. Mythology and Folk Lore. III. Graphic Systems and Literature. IV. Linguistic. Philadelphia, *Porter & Coates*, 1890. (Through Messrs. Cushings & Bailey.)

Cookson (C.) and King (J. E.) An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. (Through Messrs. Cushings & Co., Baltimore.) \$1.40.

Curtius' Griechische Schulgrammatik bearbeitet von Dr. W. von Hartel. 20 Auflage. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1890. geb. m. 2.40.

Dawes (E. A. S.) The Pronunciation of Greek, with suggestions for a reform in teaching that language. London, *D. Nutt*, 1889.

Euripides. Iphigenia at Aulis. With introduction and notes by C. E. S. Headlam. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1889.

Goodwin (W. W.) Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. Rewritten and enlarged. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. \$2.15.

Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie unter Mitwirkung von Karl v. Amila, W. Arndt, O. Bebhagel et al. Herausg. v. Hermann Paul. 1. Band, 3. Liefg. II. Band, 1. Abteilg., 2. Liefg. 2. Abteilg., 2. Lief. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1890.

Haigh (A. E.) The Attic Theatre. A description of the stage and theatre of the Athenians and of the dramatic performances at Athens. With facsimiles and illustrations. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1889. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*

Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Herausg. von Iwan Müller. II. Band, zweite Hälfte. Griechische u. lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. (Zweite völlig neubearbeitete u. vermehrte Aufl.) München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1890.

Henry (Victor). A Short Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin for schools and colleges. London, *Swan Sonnenschein & Co.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. (Through Messrs. Cushings & Co., Baltimore.) \$1.90.

Herodotus, The History of. Translated into English by G. C. Macaulay. Vols. I, II. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890.

Herodotos. Erkl. von Heinrich Stein. Vierter Band, Buch VII. Mit 3 Kärtchen von H. Kiepert. 5te verb. Auflage. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 2.10.

Hogarth (D. G.) Devia Cypria. Notes of an archaeological journey in Cyprus in 1888. London, *Henry Frowde*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1889.

Homers Ilias in verkürzter Ausgabe. Für den Schulgebrauch von A. Th. Christ. Mit 9 Abbildungen u. 2 Karten. Wien u. Prag, *Tempisky*, 1890. geb. 1 fl. 5 kr.

Homeri Ilias. Scholarum in usum ed. Paulus Cauer. Pars I, Carm. I-XII. Ed. maior. Vindobonae et Pragae, *F. Tempisky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*, 1890. m. 3. Ed. minor, m. 1.50.

Homer. Odyssey. Book XXI. With introduction, notes, and appendices by G. M. Edwards. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1890.

Horatius, Q. (H. Flaccus). Erklärt von Hermann Schütz. Erster Teil. Oden u. Epoden. Dritte Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 3.

Hübner (Emil). Römische Herrschaft in West-Europa. Berlin, *Wilhelm Hertz (Bessersche Buchhandlung)*, 1890.

Jahn (Albert). Dionysiaca. Sprachliche u. sachliche Platonische Blütenlese aus Dionysius, dem sog. Areopagiten. Altona u. Leipzig, *A. C. Dreher*. 1889.

Iosephi (Flavii). Ed. et apparatu critico instruxit Benedictus Niese. Vol. V. De Iudaeorum Vetustate sive contra Apionem Libri VI. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 5. Ed. minor, m. 1.20.

Kaegi (Adolf). Griechische Schulgrammatik mit Repetitionstabellen als Anhang. Zweite, vielfach veränderte u. erweiterte Auflage. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 3.40.

Klinger's Faust. Eine litteraturhistorische Untersuchung von Dr. Georg Joseph Pfeiffer. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausg. von Bernhard Seuffert. Würtzburg, *Georg Hertz*, 1890.

Lateinisches Lese- u. Übungsbuch für die II. Classe der österreichischen Gymnasien. Mit einer Wortkunde. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempisky*, 1890. geb. 1 fl. 40 kr.

Lexicon Caesarianum. Confecit H. Meusel. Fascicul. XIV, XV (Vol. II, Fascicul. VI, VII) paene-que. Berlin, *W. Weber*, 1890.

Livi (T.) Ab urbe condita libri. Apparatu critico adiecto edidit Augustus Luchs. Vol. IV, Libros XXVI-XXX continens. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 3.

Livy. Book IV. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press by H. M. Stephenson. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1890.

Lucianus. Recognovit Iulius Sommerbrodt. Voluminis primi, Pars posterior. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 6.

Meister (Richard). Zum eleischen, arkadischen u. kyprischen Dialekte. Leipzig, *Giesecke u. Devrient*, 1890.

Molière. Les Précieuses Ridicules. With introduction and notes by E. G. W. Brauholtz. Ed. for the Syndics of the University Press. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1890.

Moulton (Richard G.) The Ancient Classical Drama. A study in literary evolution. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. (Through Messrs. Cushings & Co., Baltimore.) \$2.25.

Neue (F.) Formenlehre der Lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Band. Adjectiva, Numeralia, Adverbia, Praepositionen, Conjunctionen, Interjectionen. Dritte, gänzlich neu bearbeitete Aufl. von C. Wagener. Neunte u. zehnte Lieferung. Berlin, *Calvary*, 1890. Subscr. preis, m. 3; Ladenpr. m. 4.

Pliny's Letters. Books I and II. With introduction, notes, and plan. Ed. by James Cowan. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1889. \$1.10.

Plutarch's Life of Timoleon. With introduction, notes, maps, and lexicon by H. A. Holden. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1889.

Rutherford (W. G.) The Fourth Book of Thucydides. A revision of the text, illustrating the principal causes of corruption in the MSS of this author. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1889. \$2.

Studia in Priscos Scriptores Latinos collata. Vol. I, Fasc. post. (Studien auf dem Gebiete des archaischen Lateins. Herausg. von Wilhelm Studemund.) Erster Band, Zweites Heft. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1890. m. 7.

Tacitus' Germania. Erklärt von U. Zernial, mit einer Karte von H. Kiepert. (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung.) Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1890. m. 1.40.

Tacitus. The Histories. Books III, IV, and V. With introduction and notes by A. D. Godley. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. \$1.25.

Thukydides. Erkl. von J. Classen. Zweiter Band, Zweites Buch, Vierte Aufl. besorgt von J. Steup. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 2.25.

Weil (Henri). Observations sur les fragments d'Euripide à propos d'une nouvelle édition des Fragments des Tragiques Grecs. (Revue des Études Grecques.) Paris, *Ernest Leroux*, 1890.

Xenophon, The Works of. Translated by H. G. Dakyns in four volumes. Vol I. Hellenica, Books I and II, and Anabasis. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1890. \$2.25.

Xenophon's Anabasis. Für den Schulgebrauch, herausg. von Andreas Weidner. Wien, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*, 1890. geb. 1 fl. 10 kr.

— Memorabilien. Erkl. von Ludwig Breitenbach. Sechste Aufl. bearbeitet von Rudolf Mücke. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1889. m. 2.25.

Young (C. A.) The Elements of Astronomy. Boston and London, *Ginn & Co.*, 1890. \$1.35.

Zarncke (Ed.) Die Entstehung der Griechischen Literatursprachen. Leipzig, *T. v. Weigel Nachfolger*, 1890. m. 1.20.